UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

FOR THE DISTRICT OF ARIZONA

United States of America,

plaintiff.

plaintiff.

CR15-00707-PHX-SRB

vs.

Phoenix, Arizona

March 11, 2016

Abdul Malik Abdul Kareem,

Defendant.

Defendant.

BEFORE: THE HONORABLE SUSAN R. BOLTON, JUDGE REPORTER'S TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS

JURY TRIAL - DAY 16

(Pages 2717 through 2899, Inclusive.)

APPEARANCES:

For the Government:

U.S. ATTORNEY'S OFFICE
By: Kristen Brook, Esq.
 Joseph Edward Koehler, Esq.
40 North Central Avenue, Suite 1200
Phoenix, AZ 85004

For the Defendant Abdul Malik Abdul Kareem:

MAYNARD CRONIN ERICKSON CURRAN & REITER PLC
By: Daniel D. Maynard, Esq.
Mary Kathleen Plomin, Esq.
3200 North Central Avenue, Suite 1800
Phoenix, AZ 85012

Official Court Reporter:

Elizabeth A. Lemke, RDR, CRR, CPE Sandra Day O'Connor U.S. Courthouse, Suite 312 401 West Washington Street, SPC 34 Phoenix, Arizona 85003-2150 (602) 322-7247

Proceedings Reported by Stenographic Court Reporter Transcript Prepared by Computer-Aided Transcription

1	INDEX	
2	SUMMARY OF COURT PROCEEDINGS	PAGE:
3		
4	FINAL INSTRUCTIONS TO THE JURY	Page 2720
5	CLOSING ARGUMENT: GOVERNMENT	Page 2736
6	CLOSING ARGUMENT: DEFENSE REBUTTAL CLOSING ARGUMENT: GOVERNMENT	Page 2800 Page 2862
0	FINAL INSTRUCTIONS TO THE JURY	Page 2887
7		
8	JURY RETIRES	Page 2895
9		
10		
11		
12		
13		
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		

PROCEEDINGS

(Called to the order of court at 9:02 a.m.)

THE COURT: Good morning, ladies and gentlemen.

Please sit down. The record will show the presence of the jury, counsel, and the defendant.

Ladies and gentlemen, let me give you a brief rundown of what we have on our schedule today. You have in front of you the final jury instructions. I'm going to read them. You can follow along as I read them or just listen. You will have these to take back with you for later reference during your deliberations, if necessary.

After I read the instructions, the government will make its closing argument. Following that, Mr. Maynard will make his closing argument for the defendant. After that there will be a final argument or a rebuttal argument by the government.

I will then read to you the last couple of instructions, go over the verdict forms with you, and when we're concluded with that, you will go back to the jury room and begin your deliberations.

I expect that the government's closing argument will take most of the morning. We'll take our usual break sometime -- I asked Mr. Koehler to kind of pick a moment when we could take our break at the right time.

Mr. Maynard will either begin his just before lunch

or just after lunch. I thought we might take a shorter lunch break today.

But then sometime, hopefully, by mid to late afternoon, you will be able to begin your deliberations.

FINAL INSTRUCTIONS TO THE JURY

Members of the jury, now that you have heard all the evidence, it is my duty to instruct you on the law that applies to this case.

It is your duty to weigh and to evaluate all the evidence received in the case and, in that process, to decide the facts. It is also your duty to apply the law as I give it to you to the facts as you find them, whether you agree with the law or not. You must decide the case solely on the evidence and the law and must not be influenced by any personal likes or dislikes, opinions, prejudices, or sympathy. You will recall that you took an oath promising to do so at the beginning of the case.

You must follow all these instructions and not single out some and ignore others; they are all important. Please do not read into these instructions or into anything I may have said or done any suggestion as to what verdict you should return. That is a matter entirely up to you.

The indictment is not evidence. The defendant has pled not guilty to the charges. The defendant is presumed to be innocent unless and until the government proves the

2.2

defendant guilty beyond a reasonable doubt. In addition, the defendant does not have to testify or present any evidence to prove innocence. The government has the burden of proving every element of each charge beyond a reasonable doubt.

Proof beyond a reasonable doubt is proof that leaves you firmly convinced the defendant is guilty. It is not required that the government prove guilty beyond all possible doubt.

A reasonable doubt is a doubt based upon reason and common sense and is not based purely on speculation. It may arise from a careful and impartial consideration of all the evidence, or from lack of evidence.

If after a careful and impartial consideration of all the evidence, you are not convinced beyond a reasonable doubt that the defendant is guilty, it is your duty to find the defendant not guilty. On the other hand, if after a careful and impartial consideration of all the evidence, you are convinced beyond a reasonable doubt that the defendant is guilty, it is your duty to find the defendant guilty.

The evidence you are to consider in deciding what facts are consists of:

One, the sworn testimony of any witness; and

Two, the exhibits received in evidence; and

Three, any facts to which the parties have agreed.

The following things are not evidence and you may not

consider them in deciding what the facts are:

One, questions, statements, objections, and arguments by the lawyers are not evidence. The lawyers are not witnesses. Although you must consider a lawyer's questions to understand the answers of a witness, the lawyer's questions are not evidence. Similarly, what the lawyers have said in there opening statements, will say in their closing arguments and at other times is intended to help you interpret the evidence, but it is not evidence. If the facts as you remember them differ from the way the lawyers state them, your memory of them controls.

Two, any testimony that I have excluded, stricken, or instructed you to disregard is not evidence.

Three, anything you may have seen or heard when the court was not in session is not evidence. You are to decide the case solely on the evidence received at the trial.

Evidence may be direct or circumstantial. Direct evidence is direct proof of a fact, such as testimony by a witness about what that witness personally saw or heard or did. Circumstantial evidence is indirect evidence, that is, it is proof of one or more facts from which you can find another fact.

You are to consider both direct and circumstantial evidence. Either can be used to prove any fact. The law makes no distinction between the weight to be given to either

```
1
      direct or circumstantial evidence. It is for you to decide
 2
      how much weight to give to any evidence.
 3
               In deciding the facts in this case, you may have to
 4
      decide which testimony to believe and which testimony not to
 5
      believe. You may believe everything a witness says, or part
      of it, or none of it.
 6
 7
               In considering the testimony of any witness, you may
      take into account:
 8
               One, the witness's opportunity and ability to see or
 9
10
      hear or know the things testified to;
11
               Two, the witness's memory;
12
               Three, the witness's manner while testifying;
               Four, the witness's interest in the outcome of the
13
      case, if any;
14
15
               Five, the witness's bias or prejudice, if any;
               Six, whether other evidence contradicted the
16
17
      witness's testimony;
               Seven, the reasonableness of the witness's testimony
18
      in light of all the evidence; and
19
               Eight, any other factors that bear on believability.
20
               The weight of the evidence as to a fact does not
21
22
      necessarily depend on the number of witnesses who testify.
23
      What is important is how believable the witnesses were, and
24
      how much weight you think their testimony deserves.
25
               You have heard testimony from persons who, because of
```

education or experience, were permitted to state opinions and the reasons for their opinions.

Such opinion testimony should be judged like any other testimony. You may accept it or reject it, and give it as much weight as you think it deserves, considering the witness's education and experience, the reasons given for the opinion, and all the other evidence in the case.

You are here only to determine whether the defendant is guilty or not guilty of the charges in the indictment. The defendant is not on trial for any conduct or offense not charged in the indictment.

You have heard testimony that the defendant made a statement. It is for you to decide, one, whether the defendant made the statement, and, two, if so, how much weight to give to it. In making those decisions, you should consider all the evidence about the statement, including the circumstances under which the defendant may have made it.

A separate crime is charged against the defendant in each count. You must decide each count separately. Your verdict on one count should not control your verdict on any other count.

The defendant is charged in Count 1 with Conspiracy
to Transport Firearms and Ammunition in Interstate Commerce
with the Intent to Commit the felonies of Murder and/or
Aggravated Assault. In order for the defendant to being found

1 guilty of this charge, the government must prove each of the 2 following elements beyond a reasonable doubt: First, beginning on or before January 7, 2015, and 3 4 continuing through May 3, 2015, there was an agreement between 5 two or more persons to transport firearms and ammunition from 6 one state to another with the intent to commit the felonies of 7 Murder and/or Aggravated Assault in Texas or with knowledge or 8 reasonable cause to believe that Murder and/or Aggravated Assault would be committed with the firearms and ammunition: 9 10 Second, the defendant became a member of the 11 conspiracy knowing of at least one of its objects and 12 intending to help accomplish it; and 13 Third, one of the members of the conspiracy performed 14 at least one overt act for the purpose of carrying out the 15 conspiracy, with all of you agreeing on a particular overt act 16 that you find was committed. 17 The overt acts alleged in the Indictment are: One, on dates beginning before January 7, 2015, and 18 ending on or before May 3, 2015, Kareem, Simpson, Soofi, and 19 other persons known and unknown traveled to remote desert 20 areas near Phoenix, Arizona, to practice shooting firearms. 21 22 Two, on dates between January 7, 2015, and May 3, 23 2015, Kareem provided firearms to Simpson and Soofi. 24 Three, on dates between February 11, 2015, and May 3, 25 2015, Kareem hosted Simpson, Soofi, and other persons known

and unknown inside his home in Phoenix, Arizona, to discuss attacking the Muhammad Art Exhibit and Contest in Garland, Texas.

Four, on dates between May 1, 2015, and May 3, 2015, Simpson and Soofi traveled from Phoenix, Arizona, to Garland, Texas, armed with firearms.

An overt act is an act that is a substantial step toward the completion of the conspiracy. An overt act does not itself have to be unlawful. A lawful act may be an element of a conspiracy if it was done for the purpose of carrying out the conspiracy. The government is not required to prove that the defendant personally did one of the overt acts.

The defendant is charged in Count 5 with Conspiracy to Provide Material Support to the Islamic State of Iraq and the Levant (ISIL), a designated foreign terrorist organization. In order for the defendant to be found guilty of this charge, the government must prove each of the following elements beyond a reasonable doubt:

First, beginning at an unknown time but no later than in or about June 2014, and continuing through May 3, 2015, there was an agreement between two or more persons to provide material support or resources to ISIL, a designated foreign terrorist organization;

Second, the defendant became a member of the

1 conspiracy knowing of its unlawful object and intending to 2 help accomplish it; 3 Third, ISIL was designated a foreign terrorist 4 organization at the time of the conspiracy; 5 Fourth, the defendant knew that at least one of the 6 following conditions existed: 7 That ISIL was a designated foreign terrorist 8 organization; or 9 That ISIL has engaged, or was engaging, in 10 terrorist activity; or 11 That ISIL has engaged, or was engaging, in 12 terrorism; and 13 Fifth, the offense occurred in whole, or in part, 14 within the United States. 15 The term "material support or resources" means any 16 property, tangible or intangible, or any service including 17 currency or monetary instruments, training, facilities, weapons, personnel (one or more individuals who may be or 18 include oneself), and transportation. 19 20 The term "training" means instruction or teach designed to impart a specific skill, as opposed to general 21 22 knowledge. The term "personnel" means one or more persons, which 23 24 can include the defendant's own person. No person may be 25 convicted, however, in connection with providing personnel,

unless that person has knowingly conspired to provide to a foreign terrorist organization with one or more individuals, (who may include the defendant), to work under that terrorist organization's direction or control or to organize, manage, supervise, or otherwise direct the operation of the organization. Individuals who act entirely independently of the foreign terrorist organization to advance its goals or objectives are not considered to be working under the foreign terrorist organization's direction and control.

You all must agree as to the type of material support or resources the defendant conspired to provide. In other words, the government must prove beyond a reasonable doubt that the defendant conspired to provide one or more of these forms of material support or resources; there is no requirement that the defendant provided all of these forms of material support or resources.

The term "terrorist activity" means any activity which is unlawful under the laws of the place where it is committed (or which, if it had been committed in the United States, would be unlawful under the laws of the United States or any State) and which involves the commission of any of the following, or a threat, attempt, or conspiracy to do any of the following:

A. The seizing or detaining, and threatening to kill, injure, or continue to detain, another individual in

order to compel a third person (including a governmental organization) to do or abstain from doing any act as an explicit or implicit condition for the release of the individual seized or detained;

B. An assassination; and

2.2

C. The use of any explosive, firearm, or other weapon or dangerous device (other than for mere personal monetary gain), with intent to endanger, directly or indirectly, the safety of one or more individuals or to cause substantial damage to property.

The term "terrorism" means premeditated, politically motivated violence perpetrated against noncombatant targets by subnational groups or clandestine agents.

A conspiracy is a kind of criminal partnership - an agreement of two or more persons to commit one or more crimes. The crime of conspiracy is the agreement to do something unlawful; it does not matter whether the crime agreed upon was committed.

For a conspiracy to have existed, it is not necessary that the conspirators made a formal agreement or that they agreed on every detail of the conspiracy. It is not however -- It is not enough, however, that they simply met, discussed matters of common interest, acted in similar ways, or perhaps helped one another. In order to find the defendant guilty of conspiracy, you must find that there was a plan to

commit the crime that was the object of the conspiracy.

One becomes a member of a conspiracy by willfully participating in the unlawful plan with the intent to advance or further some object or purpose of the conspiracy, even though the person does not have full knowledge of all the details of the conspiracy. Furthermore, one who willfully joins an existing conspiracy is as responsible for it as the originators. On the other hand, one who has no knowledge of a conspiracy, but happens to act in a way which furthers some object or purpose of the conspiracy, does not there by become a conspirator. Similarly, a person does not become a conspirator merely by associating with one or more persons who are conspirators, nor merely by knowing that a conspiracy exists.

A defendant may be found guilty of conspiracy even if the defendant personally did not commit the act or acts constituting the crime, but aided and abetted in its commission. To prove a defendant guilty of conspiracy by aiding and abetting, the government must prove each of the following elements beyond a reasonable doubt:

First, the crime of conspiracy was committed by someone;

Second, the defendant aided, counseled, commanded, induced or procured that person in committing the crime of conspiracy;

Third, the defendant acted with the intent to facilitate the conspiracy; and

Fourth, the defendant acted before the crime was completed.

It is not enough that the defendant merely associated with the person committing the crime, or unknowingly or unintentionally did things that were helpful to that person, or was present at the scene of the crime. The evidence must show beyond a reasonable doubt that the defendant acted with the knowledge and intention of helping that person commit the crime of conspiracy. A defendant acts with intent to facilitate the crime when the defendant actively participates in a criminal venture with advance knowledge of the crime and having acquired that knowledge when the defendant still had a realistic opportunity to withdraw from the crime.

The defendant is charged in Count 2 with Aiding and Abetting the Interstate Transportation of Firearms and Ammunition with the Intent to commit Murder and/or Aggravated Assault in Texas. To prove a defendant guilty of Aiding and Abetting the Interstate Transportation of Firearms and Ammunition with the intent to commit Murder and/or Aggravated Assault the government must prove each of the following elements beyond a reasonable doubt:

First, a person transported firearms and ammunition from one state to another with the intent to commit murder

2.2

and/or aggravated assault in Texas, or with knowledge or reasonable cause to believe that murder and/or aggravated assault would be committed with the firearms and ammunition;

Second, the defendant aided, counseled, commanded, induced or procured that person to transport firearms and ammunition in interstate commerce with the intent to commit murder and/or aggravated assault;

Third, the defendant acted with the intent to facilitate, transporting firearms and ammunition in interstate commerce with the intent to commit murder and/or aggravated assault; and

Fourth, the defendant acted before the crime was completed.

It is not enough that the defendant merely associated with the person committing the crime, or unknowingly or unintentionally did things that were helpful to that person, or was present at the scene of the crime. The evidence must show beyond a reasonable doubt that the defendant acted with the knowledge and intention of helping that person commit transporting firearms and ammunition in interstate commerce with the intent to commit the felonies of murder or aggravated assault.

A defendant acts with intent to facilitate the crime when the defendant actively participates in a criminal venture with advance knowledge of the crime and having acquired that

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

knowledge when the defendant still had a realistic opportunity to withdraw from the crime. Each member of a conspiracy is responsible for the actions of the other conspirators performed during the course of and in furtherance of the conspiracy. If one member of a conspiracy commits a crime in furtherance of a conspiracy, the other members have also, under the law, committed that crime. Therefore, you may find the defendant quilty of Interstate Transportation of Firearms and Ammunition with the intent to commit Murder and/or Aggravated Assault as charged in Count 2 if the government has proved each of the following elements beyond a reasonable doubt: First, the person involved in the conspiracy charged in Count 1 and/or Count 5 knowingly and intentionally transported firearms and ammunition from one state to another; Second, that person intended to commit Murder and/or Aggravated Assault, or had knowledge or reasonable cause to

believe that Murder and/or Aggravated Assault would be committed with the firearms and ammunition;

Third, that person was a member of the conspiracy charged in Count 1 and/or Count 5;

Fourth, that person transported firearms and ammunition from one state to another with the intent to commit Murder and/or Aggravated Assault in furtherance of the conspiracy;

1 Fifth, the defendant was a member of the same 2 conspiracy at the time that the offense charged in Count 2 was 3 committed; and Sixth, the offense fell within the scope of the 5 unlawful agreement and could reasonably have been foreseen to 6 be a necessary or natural consequence of the unlawful 7 agreement. The defendant is charged in Count 3 with False 8 Statements to the FBI. In order for the defendant to be found 9 10 quilty of this charge, the government must prove each of the 11 following elements beyond a reasonable doubt: 12 First, on or about May 5, 2015, the defendant made a 13 false statement to the FBI, with all of you agreeing on the 14 false statement he made: 15 Second, the defendant acted willfully; that is, the 16 defendant acted deliberately and with knowledge both that the 17 statement was untrue and that his conduct was unlawful; and Third, the statement was material to the activities 18 or decisions of the FBI; that is, it had a natural tendency to 19 influence, or was capable of influencing, the agency's 20 decisions or activities. 21 22 The alleged false statements are: 23 One, that defendant did not go shooting in the desert 24 with Simpson and Soofi before May 3, 2015; 25 Two, that before May 3, 2015, neither Simpson nor

1 Soofi fired the weapons they used in connection with the 2 attack in Garland, Texas; 3 Three, that defendant did not know in advance that 4 Simpson and Soofi planned to conduct an attack in Garland, 5 Texas; and 6 Four, that defendant did not know about the Muhammad 7 Art Exhibit and Contest that was to take place in Garland, 8 Texas, on May 3, 2015, until after Simpson and Soofi were killed while attempting to conduct an attack on the contest. 9 10 The defendant is charged in Count 4 with Felon in Possession of Firearms. In order for the defendant to be 11 12 found quilty of this charge, the government must prove each of 13 the following elements beyond a reasonable doubt: 14 First, on or about June 10, 2015, the defendant 15 knowingly possessed a Taurus model 85 Ultralite .38 caliber 16 revolver and/or a Tanfoqlio model Witness 9 millimeter pistol, 17 with all of you agreeing on the particular firearm he possessed; 18 Second, the Taurus model 85 Ultralite .38 caliber 19 revolver and the Tanfoqlio model Witness 9 millimeter pistol 20 had been shipped or transported from one state to another 21 22 state; and 23 Third, at the time the defendant possessed the Taurus 24 model 85 Ultralite .38 caliber revolver and/or the Tanfoglio 25 model Witness 9 millimeter pistol, the defendant had been

convicted of Aggravated Driving While Under the Influence in the State of Arizona, a felony.

A person has possession of something if the person knows of its presence and has the physical control of it, or knows of its presence and has the power and intention to control it.

An act is done knowingly if the defendant is aware of the act and does not act through ignorance, mistake, or accident. The government is not required to prove that the defendant knew that his acts or omissions were unlawful except with respect to the crime of False Statements to the FBI as charged in Count 3. You may consider evidence of the defendant's words, acts, or omissions, along with all the other evidence, in deciding whether the defendant acted knowingly.

Mr. Koehler, you may make your closing argument.

CLOSING ARGUMENT: GOVERNMENT

MR. KOEHLER: Thank you, Your Honor, and good morning everyone.

I would like to begin by taking a minute to thank you all for your attentiveness throughout this trial.

Jury service is always a challenge and is especially a challenge in a case that lasts as long as this one has and as complex as this one has been. So thank you on behalf of the trial team in this case.

1 We are here to talk about this case that involved 2 this attack in Garland, Texas, on May 3 of 2015. 3 I'm not going to spend a lot of time talking about 4 the events as they happened specifically in Garland, simply 5 because that evidence is clear and undisputed in this case. 6 Elton Simpson and Nadir Soofi drove to Garland, 7 Texas, with the intent to commit mass murder against the 8 people who were attending the Draw Muhammad Contest at the Curtis Coldwell Center there in Garland, Texas. 9 10 They showed up, pulled out their guns, and 11 thankfully, Officer Gregory Stevens was alert and was well 12 trained and he stopped that attack right there before it got 13 into the Culwell Center. 14 The ultimate questions that are before you in this 15 case are really just two: Did the defendant Abdul Malik Abdul 16 Kareem know that Elton Simpson, who everybody knew as 17 "Ibrahim," and Nadir Soofi were planning to conduct those attacks in support of ISIS, not just the Garland attack, but 18 the other things that they planned to do -- and we'll talk 19 about that in a minute. 20 The second thing is: Did he encourage or help them 21 22 or join them in those plans? 23 I'm going to get into detail in a moment, but first 24 off, the government has proven in this case beyond a

reasonable doubt that the defendant knew that Elton Simpson

25

and Nadir Soofi were ISIS supporters.

He knew himself. You heard it in his interview statements and his post-arrest statements that were recorded. You heard it from Juan. You heard it from Carlos. From Stefan Verdugo. From AK Wahid. You also heard it from Abdullah Mubarak when he talked about their arguments about the existence of a Khalifah. And you also heard it from Ali Soofi.

He also knew that they had planned to conduct attacks. Sergio Martinez told you about how he was pushy about going shooting. Abdul Khabir Wahid told you about how he talked to the defendant -- and he's a defense witness, by the way -- talked to the defendant about the fact that Simpson and Soofi had planned to go attack a Marine base.

Nathaniel Soofi told you about how his father Nadir told him about different attacks that he planned to conduct, not just the Garland contest, but running over soldiers at Luke Air Force Base and going and attacking a base, a recruiting station.

Stefan Verdugo. He told you how the defendant wanted to be a part of the Garland attack. He tried to talk the defendant out of that.

Juan. He told you about how the defendant wanted to strap a bomb to himself and go blow himself up in a mall and also about the Garland contest as well.

And you have Carlos telling you from the witness stand that the defendant was considering providing an AK47 to Elton Simpson for protection.

Also, his actions following the attack. His efforts to cover up his involvement and his closeness to Elton Simpson and Nadir Soofi are evidence of his knowledge of what they were doing.

He also helped. He helped them acquire firearms. He loaned money for the AK47 and the AK47. And Stefan Verdugo also told you that the defendant gave Elton Simpson the .357 that Elton Simpson had in the pocket of his pants when the Garland attack occurred. And we'll get into that in more detail.

He took them shooting to a secluded location. He went shooting with them in the desert; not just the times that Sergio told you about, but also the times that Ali Soofi told you about and Stefan Verdugo.

He helped them maintain their firearms. Taught them how to take them apart, clean them, lubricate them, put them back together. He also provided ammunition that was taken with them to the attack. And, again, we'll get into more detail on this, but he admitted buying that ammunition for himself during his post-arrest interview. And the lot numbers on the ammunition found in Garland, found in the Simpson and Soofi apartment, and found in Mr. Kareem -- Abdul Kareem's

1 apartment all matched. That's that .38 Special ammunition. 2 What was the defendant's role? He was a motivator. 3 He was a bank roller. He was a trainer and an intended 4 participant. Let's walk through the charges that you have 5 here and then we'll go into the detail on a couple of them 6 first and then in more detail later on the others. 7 The first charge is conspiracy to transport firearms 8 in interstate commerce with intent to commit a felony. 9 The second is aiding and abetting the actual 10 transportation of the firearms in interstate commerce with the 11 intent to commit a felony. 12 The third charge is false statements to the FBI. 13 The fourth charge is felon in possession of a 14 firearm. 15 And finally, the conspiracy to provide material 16 support to a foreign terrorist organization. 17 Before we go further, I want to knock out the easiest charge in this case, the "felon in possession" charge. That 18 charge has three elements. 19 20 First, that the defendant knowingly possessed the 21 Taurus model 85 Ultralite .38 caliber revolver and/or the 22 Tanfoglio model Witness 9 millimeter pistol with all of you 23 agreeing on which firearm he possessed. 24 Well, in this case you have the evidence that the 25 Tanfoglio was found in the couch of his apartment. It had his

fingerprint on it. And later the defendant admitted from the witness stand that that was his gun.

The .38 Special was in the defendant's bag in the back of the U-Haul truck that he was driving, his moving truck. And he admitted from the stand that that was his gun. You also heard from Sean Raper that he had purchased that gun from Mr. Raper directly.

Those firearms were transported and shipped in interstate commerce and they were also imported into the United States from a foreign country, both guns. One came from Brazil, the Taurus. The Tanfoglio, the 9 millimeter, came from Italy. Both imported to Florida and both had to have come from Florida to the State of Arizona, and therefore, crossed state lines.

Finally, the defendant's felony conviction. You have Exhibit 139, his felony conviction for Aggravated DUI. You also have his admission from the witness stand that he has not one, but two felonies.

So there you have all of the elements of Felon in Possession of a Firearm.

The Conspiracy to Provide Material Support is really the heart of the case in this case. All of the evidence that supports the "material support" charged in this case drives the existence of proof on the other counts and establishes the other counts beyond a reasonable doubt, just like it does the

1	material support conspiracy.		
2	That conspiracy began sometime between June of 2014		
3	and ran through May 3 of 2015 with the failed attack in		
4	Garland, Texas.		
5	It was an agreement between two or more people to		
6	provide material support or resources to ISIL, also known as		
7	ISIS.		
8	The defendant became a member of that conspiracy		
9	knowing of its unlawful object and intending to accomplish it.		
10	These are the rest of the elements:		
11	The government has to prove that ISIL was a		
12	designated foreign terrorist organization.		
13	In this case you have a stipulation that that's a		
14	fact, that ISIL was, in fact, a designated foreign terrorist		
15	organization.		
16	You have evidence and we will get into this		
17	that the defendant knew that ISIL engaged in terrorist		
18	activity or terrorism.		
19	And, of course, the offense occurred in the United		
20	States.		
21	All of the proof that you have seen here in this		
22	courtroom is about conduct and activity that occurred in the		
23	State of Arizona and the State of Texas.		
24	Here is the definition of "material support or		
25	resources." It includes any service, including currency or		

monetary instruments, training, facilities, weapons, personnel, which can be one or more individuals who may or may not include oneself, and transportation.

"Any service" includes service in the form of a violent attack within the United States, whether it be strapping a bomb to oneself and detonating inside of a mall, attacking a sporting event, attacking a U.S. military base or U.S. military personnel, or attacking the Draw Muhammad Contest.

Training. "Training" is instruction or teaching designed to impart a specific skill as opposed to general knowledge. That would include shooting practice, firearms maintenance, disassembling, cleaning, lubricating, and reassembling a firearm. All critical to how you make a firearm continue to operate and not jam.

"Personnel." You have to have an agreement to provide one or more individuals who may include any of the co-conspirators to work under the terrorist organization's direction or control. Importantly, individuals who act entirely independently of the terrorist organization are not considered to be working under its direction or control.

But if they are doing anything that submits themselves to the terrorist organizations directions or control, they are, in fact, conspiring to provide personnel.

Let's talk about "aiding and abetting" for a minute.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

The defendant is guilty of conspiracy, even if he didn't directly become a member of the conspiracy. In other words, let's say, for instance, that Simpson and Soofi had a conspiracy and they didn't really consider the defendant to be part of their plans but he knew of their plan. He knew what their conspiracy was and he intended to help them in committing that conspiracy. He's quilty as though he did it. If one person knows that another person is committing a crime and chooses to help that person and has the intent to help them succeed in committing the crime, the person who helps is as guilty as though they did the crime themselves. We have to prove the conspiracy existed, that he aided, counseled, commanded, induced, or procured, in other words, helped or encouraged them, and that he acted with intent to facilitate that conspiracy. And finally, he has to have acted before the conspiracy ended, which is May 3 of 2015. All right. Let's talk about what that conspiracy It was a violent jihad. It's not just one thing. It's a series of things. Travel to the Middle East. Hijra. You'll hear more about that in a moment. Attacking the Super Bowl or West Gate or another shopping mall. Attacking U.S. military personnel such as Major Fedoruk whose name was in that notepad, recruiting station or soldiers near a base. Again, making an attack

within the United States against these types of things is violent jihad on behalf of ISIL.

Finally, attacking the Garland contest. Those are all violent jihad plans.

You have to have two or more people to have a conspiracy. Well, first off, you have two right away; Simpson and Soofi who are both dead in the street in Garland. But you also have the defendant. You also have other people with whom they were communicating; specifically, Junaid Hussan, Miski, and you saw Simpson's direct messages with both of them in his Twitter feed, and others known and unknown as alleged in the Indictment that you heard in the beginning of the case.

What is the evidence of the agreement? First off, you have them watching these ISIL videos both in their apartment and in the defendant's house. And you have Sheikh Adnanis call. Remember, he's the official spokesman for ISIS and we'll get to that in more detail later.

And he made a call to either travel to the United -or to the Islamic State to commit hijra and join the Islamic
Army; or if you can't get here, he said, conduct attacks in
your homeland, kill people by any means necessary, whether
you're stabbing them, shooting them, hitting them on the head
with a rock, or running them over with a car.

You have Elton Simpson researching travel to the Islamic State, the hijra. And you have that Exhibit 47. It

1 will be in the JERS system. You're going to have a TV screen 2 with a computer attached to it that will let you look at all 3 of these exhibits. 4 One of the things that he had in that white Samsung 5 Galaxy phone is Exhibit 47, a publication called Hijra To The 6 Islamic State. It explains who to contact, where you need to 7 go, and how to get there. 8 You also have him downloading information about U.S. military members from the Islamic State Hacking Division and 9 10 then writing down Major Fedoruk's information in the notebook, 11 again, showing that this is what their agreement is. 12 And finally, you have the ISIS flags at the Garland 13 scene which are on the table here in front of you. 14 what they took with them when they went to go conduct that 15 attack because they wanted to announce to the world: 16 here on behalf of ISIS. 17 Let's talk about that hijra for a moment. First, you have items that tie Mr. Kareem to knowing about that plan; and 18 that is, Mr. Simpsons e-mail to Mr. Kareem about travel 19 restrictions. You heard Mr. Kareem announce from the stand 20 that, oh, he just forwarded that e-mail to me to print. 21 22 I'm going to show you something in a minute that shows the lie in that statement. 23 24 I got way ahead of myself.

Okay. Sorry about that. I hit the wrong button.

25

The LG 440 phone from the Simpson and Soofi apartment, again, has information about hijra to the Islamic State. And specifically, there's photos about -- there's photos of another telephone in which texts were being exchanged about traveling to Bulgaria and then going to Sabiha Gokcen Airport in Turkey which is very near the Syrian border in order to get into Syria and join the Islamic State.

You have the reference to the same notebook. It's written on the top of one of the pages in that notebook from Garland and you have a photocopy of that page that is in evidence. And then you have Nathaniel Soofi, a defense witness, telling you how his dad Nadir Soofi was intending to travel to the Middle East to join the Islamic Army.

All right. Let's look at that e-mail here.

On the right you have an e-mail from Andrea Olguin who is a probation officer to Elton Simpson. July 24, 2014.

And you'll have this in the JERS system, so you'll be able to look at the whole thread.

But Elton Simpson had sent her an e-mail asking about travel restrictions because he couldn't board a plane two years earlier to go see his grandmothers when they passed away, in wanting to know: Is there something going on that's stopping me from traveling?

This is in July 2014, right after the announcement of a Khalifate in the Islamic State.

She responds back to him letting him know, no, there's not any restrictions on your travel. You just need to give me ten days' notice before you travel and get permission. And she says that international travel is different and you'll have to communicate with me about that.

That's back in July of 2014. When does he send this to the defendant? Well, first, he sends it from his Yahoo account verily there signs it Yahoo.com. He forwards that to his personal Gmail account, the "ibrahimibrahim602" account, walling it off, and then forwards it on to Abdul Malik Abdul Kareem at his "gitrdonemoving" e-mail on November 9th.

You mean he could not have printed that e-mail if he really needed to print it for some reason between July 24 and November 9? What's the significance of that?

This puts him in the time frame where he is studying hijra to the Islamic State. It's also after the announcement by Sheikh Adnani of the call for people to travel to the Islamic State and fight on behalf of the Islamic State. He's letting Abdul Malik Abdul Kareem know that he has problems with international travel.

You also have the research into going there and this is the communication:

But when you get a flight from Bulgaria you get a flight to Sabiha Gokcen Airport not the Ataturk, in other words, a different airport in Turkey.

1 Bless you. 2 The next text message is just as important: 3 You're not one way. You're have a trip both ways to 4 IST and back from Bulgaria. 5 Why? Because these folks know that law enforcement 6 and intelligence agencies are looking for people engaged in 7 one-way travel to areas that are near Syria. They are on the 8 lookout and they're being advised here how to get in without being detected. 9 10 Let's talk next about his conversations with Mujahid Miski. He's still thinking about how he might get there 11 12 despite the travel restrictions. 13 Mujahid Miski tells him: 14 You will lose an opportunity to do something good 15 like Hijra. Then you'll be saddened over the loss of that 16 great opportunity and you'll miss out of a lot of Ajar -- in 17 other words "reward" -- because of that. Allah will hold you back from doing so, so that you can get another opportunity 18 for a better place with greater Ajar. The time between the 19 20 two H's is a bit long -- again referring to "hijra." It's not going to be as soon as you lose the first opportunity. It's 21 22 going to be a bit later. 23 He said it will happen again. Insha Allah, meaning "God willing," but to a better place. 24 25 And then Elton Simpson -- and this is a really

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

important thing, because it shows his intention to place himself under the guidance and control of the Khalifah, and specifically, to do things on behalf of the Islamic State. When Sheikh Adnani gives a public address, can we assume this is what Al Khalifah wants as well? Seeing that Adnani is the spokesman and seeing that Al Khalifah hasn't come out to correct what Sheikh Adnani is saying. Miski responds: Yes akhil Kareem, Adnani never speaks unless he's been ordered by the khalif of the Muslims. He can never speak without the order of the Khalif. They go on from here: Maybe then it's possible that the ajar is in what he has said earlier. Again, referring back to that call for attacks in the United States if you can't make hijra to the Islamic State.

And Afwan the Sheikh said Allah will hold you back for something far better in Ajar than the last time. It could be H or something else.

Akhi yes, matter of fact, that is far better in Ajar than hijra is right now. In other words, the Sheikh is telling you, attacking in your homeland and placing fear in the hearts of your people in your homeland is far greater in Ajar than traveling to the Middle East and committing hijra there.

1 Now, let's talk about Kareem's knowledge that ISIL is 2 a terrorist organization, in other words, engaged in terrorist activity. 3 4 Simpson and Soofi played those ISIL videos regularly; 5 the beheadings, the mass executions, the people riding around 6 in trucks armed, the motivational videos showing people being 7 killed allegedly by U.S. troops, innocent people being killed 8 in the Middle East in order to get people fired up. 9 Mr. Abdul Kareem is interviewed, admitted having seen 10 on Mr. Simpsons phone that ISIL video of the Jordanian pilot being burned alive. That's in Exhibit 422 and I'll play that 11 12 in a second. 13 In addition, he played those same types of videos 14 himself. You heard it from the boys Juan and Carlos. You 15 heard it from Stefan Verdugo. And you heard from Ali about him watching those same videos in the Simpson and Soofi 16 17 apartment. So this is what he had to say about that Jordanian 18 19 pilot video. (Playing an excerpt of Exhibit No 442 to the jury.) 20 MR. KOEHLER: All right. Let's go on from there. 21 22 So he admits right there that he saw that Jordanian pilot being burned alive in the cage on Elton Simpsons phone. 23 24 He also admitted knowing that Simpson and Soofi had been 25 looking at terrorist materials.

1 This is in Exhibit 412, again, part of his 2 post-arrest interview. He said: 3 I be looking at them, like, you know what, leave, like, you know, like getting on the Internets and stuff like 4 5 that. I'd be like you guys are stupid. Get off that stuff. 6 You know what I mean. You already got in trouble before for 7 that, you know what I mean. And then here is the context for that. Remember back 8 in 2012, the raid at the Vista house where they took his 9 10 Lenovo laptop? 11 Ibrahim would come about once or twice a week. 12 was over off of Vista. This was on Vista and we wind up staying over there. And then after they move to Cochise he 13 14 started getting on the computer, looking at different videos, 15 and I wasn't with all that stuff with them watching those 16 videos and everything, so I told them they had to leave. 17 That's what he said again in his June 10, 2015 post-arrest interview about having seen Elton Simpson and 18 others looking at these terrorist materials. So he knew 19 exactly what was going on with these folks. 20 More knowledge of the conspiracy. 21 22 He admitted that he knew Simpson and Soofi wanted to 23 travel to the Middle East to support ISIS. 24 Here is what he said in his June 10, 2015 recorded 25 interview, and that is Exhibit 411.

```
1
               I heard them say stuff but I never -- I don't know
 2
      what they -- they basically was talking about leaving. Do you
 3
      know what I mean?
               Here is the important part.
 5
               They basically were going to get out of here and go
 6
      to the Dola.
 7
               Now, Agent Whitson explained to you that the Dola is
      a reference to al dala, the word dala being the "D" in diash,
 8
      the Arabic acronym for the Islamic State.
 9
10
               But I don't know where that's at, you know what I
11
      mean?
12
               So he knew they wanted to travel and to fight on
13
      behalf of a terrorist organization.
14
               You also have Abdullah Mubarak talking about his
      conversations here on the witness stand with Mr. Abdul Kareem.
15
16
               So you said back to him: There's no Khalifah.
17
               Right.
               The last was the Prophet Muhammad.
18
               Right.
19
               And presently there is no Khalifah.
20
               Right.
21
22
               And then you mentioned him pushing back and saying:
23
      There is a Khalifah.
24
               Well, you know, I guess he must have thought that
25
      there was a Khalifah, but I clearly told him: Ain't no
```

1 Khalifahs. 2 And then later he answers a question -- answers a 3 question about whether the defendant brought that up at other 4 times. 5 Quite a few different times, you know, but, you know, 6 I kind of let him, you know, look, ain't no such thing. There's no Khalifah. Ain't going to be none. 7 And I said: I didn't even want to talk about, you 8 know, kind of sway me. It's your beliefs, you know what I 9 10 mean? He had to call his son to get his son to tell Abdul 11 Malik Abdul Kareem that there's no Khalifah. 12 13 Now, who has a Khalifah? Only one group in the 14 terror world right now in the Islamic world is claiming to of a Khalifah in modern times and that's ISIL. You heard that 15 16 from Evan Kohlmann. You heard that from others in this case. 17 Okay. Let's talk about some of the witnesses who knew Mr. Abdul Kareem. You have Carlos. You have Juan. 18 Stefan Verdugo. Sergio Martinez. Nicole Medellin. Giovanni. 19 20 Abdullah Mubarak. Ali Soofi. Nathaniel Soofi. And AK Wahid. 21 Let's talk about Carlos first. 22 He was an eighth grade student. He knew the 23 defendant through his older brother for about a year. His 24 interactions with the defendant happened back in seventh 25 grade, so a year ago and before, and that's how he remembered

some of the timing of things.

He did odd jobs for the defendant. He received gifts and money from the defendant. He went to the defendant's house all the time and he spent the night there. He converted to Islam. Why? Because the defendant told him that if he wanted to be the defendant's friend, he had to convert to Islam. A little bit of coercion there?

The last time he saw the defendant was shortly before the defendant moved away from the Cochise house. So he's had no contact with him in the past year because we're now in March of 2016. So it's been about a year since he had contact with him.

Carlos told you about seeing that video of the

Jordanian pilot the next morning, how the defendant showed him
the Fox News video of it. The defendant was laughing so loud
that it woke up Carlos. And then the defendant got him and
brought him into the living room to show him the video of this
guy being burned alive inside a cage. Who shows that kind of
thing to a child?

Let's talk about the Garland contest. The defendant told him about the Garland contest before the contest took place. He talked about giving an AK47 to Ibrahim because he knew Ibrahim was going to go there and he was going to need protection for himself when he went to attack it. And then he talked about killing kafirs. He said: If I had to shoot a

kafir, I would.

Let's talk about Juan. Juan is Carlos's older brother who is in the ninth grade now. He was in the eighth grade when all this was going on. He also went to the house on Cochise after school most days and sometimes slept at the defendant's house.

He saw Ibrahim when he was there. He also converted to Islam and was learning Arabic. One of the things he saw there with Ibrahim and the defendant was an execution video. And he described it for you involving 13 Muslims standing with these three cameramen. And one of the Muslims had a sword to the cameramans throat as the cameraman was telling his family that they were going to be okay.

The defendant showed these things on the TV in his house using a Roku system. That's part of why you don't necessarily see as much on the electronic devices from the defendant's house is because he was streaming it off of a Roku.

He also told you that the defendant literally wanted to strap himself to a bomb and go inside a mall with innocent people and just blow them up.

Another time after the defendant had been pulled over by a police officer for what he thought was no reason, he said he wanted to strap himself to a bomb and go inside and kill people. Not a reaction to the officer, but a reaction toward

1 innocent people. Why? 2 Juan heard Mr. Abdul Kareem talking to Ibrahim about that contest three different times before the attack. 3 First time he was in the back bedroom and heard them 5 getting angry about what he called an Osama bin Laden Contest. 6 The second time he went to a hallway to listen and 7 used -- I'm sorry -- he went to the hallway to listen and watched the defendant and Ibrahim in the prayer room using the 8 mirror in the house. 9 10 He said the defendant was angry at the people hosting 11 the contest and that he just wanted to go there and shoot them 12 or wanted to go there and just shoot them. 13 The second time he was in the defendant's vehicle and 14 he overheard the defendant talking to Ibrahim on the phone. 15 The defendant had a bluetooth audio system and he could hear 16 him over that. And he heard him chuckling about the Texas 17 attack. The third time back at the house he heard the 18 defendant talking to Ibrahim and AK Wahid about that contest. 19 Juan also told you about Kareem's fascination with 20

Juan also told you about Kareem's fascination with the end of times and he showed him a video about it. And his testimony here was once the trumpets started to sound in the sky, the Apocalypse was coming.

21

22

23

24

25

Interestingly, Kareem had those Soldier of Allah 2 images on his Nextbook tablet that evoked the End of Times

1 imagery and those are Exhibits 453, 454, and 455. 2 And Soofi's Dell laptop had that picture of the End 3 Of Time...A New Beginning on his laptop, and that's Exhibit 260 and those are right here. In the upper right you see the 5 Soldier of Allah 2 and there's quotes. 6 And I won't go into the specifics of the quotes. 7 can look at them on JERS later. But you can see the End of Time imagery there. It corroborates what Juan was telling you 8 about Mr. Abdul Kareem's fascination with that. 9 10 Not so coincidentally, that's also how ISIS sells 11 They're headquartered in Rocca. They talk about the 12 Final Battle in Dabig. They name their magazine Dabig. And 13 you have Dabiq Issues 5 and 8 from Mr. Simpson's cellphone in 14 evidence here. They are Exhibits 45 and 46. 15 You also have Exhibit 40 from Elton Simpsons phone. Which nation does rum in the hadith of the last days 16 17 refer to? Well, Anwar al-Awlaki answered that question in the 18 Hereafter CD that was found in Mr. Kareem's possessions. 19 (Playing an excerpt of Exhibit 113 to the jury.) 20 MR. KOEHLER: So he's talking about the Caucasians, 21 22 the people from the West, and I didn't play the whole 23 recording, but it's the people from the West. That's who he's 24 talking about who are going to be in that Battle at Dabig at 25 the End of Time. We played more of that for you during the

trial, but I just wanted that little snip for you here.

I want to move on next to Sergio Martinez. He's known the defendant since he was about 18 years old, so about 12 years. He had the defendant over to his mothers house with Simpson to go shooting.

One of the more interesting things that happened while they were shooting, Simpson's gun jammed. So right there, Mr. Abdul Kareem knows that Simpson is not doing a good job of taking care of his guns. That came out on cross-examination. That wasn't on direct.

Mr. Maynard asked that question of Sergio Martinez and he told you that that gun jammed. And so at that point when they couldn't unjam that gun, he knew that Simpson needed to know how to properly clean, disassemble, clean, lubricate, and reassemble a firearm.

The defendant asked him to take Simpson and Soofi shooting in the desert and he was pushy about going shooting. Why? Well, this is in January. What's coming up at the first part of February? The Super Bowl that he had told Stefan Verdugo that they wanted to attack with pipe bombs.

Let's talk about the shooting trip out to Wittmann.

That group came to Martinezs house before going shooting and prayed inside before they left. Ibrahim and Simpson both shot firearms that had been found in Garland.

You heard Sergio Martinez talk about the fact that

the guns used in Garland were the same guns that were brought to the Wittmann scene when they went shooting there. He also told you that Ibrahim ran backward and forward and side to side while shooting.

You heard Agent Jenkins from the FBI who is the ERT team leader and went out and collected the shells. All those little flags they put in the ground showed that pattern of movement forward and backward and side to side while firing. And even the defendant himself made a partial admission to that -- oh, yeah, I kind of saw him moving -- when he was testifying here just the other day.

And you had Rodney Jiggetts from the FBI confirm for you that the shell casings from that scene matched those firearms that were found in Garland, Texas.

Mr. Martinez expressed concern to his wife Nicole

Medellin when he got home from shooting. Why? Well, he told
you they looked like terrorists while they were shooting,
specifically talking about Ibrahim.

About a week or so after the house -- after the attack, the defendant went to Sergio Martinezs house. And you know that not only because of Sergio Martinez. You know that because Agent Whitson told you that they were tracking the defendant and he had been followed to Mr. Martinezs house.

In fact, the defendant, in taking the witness stand here in the case, didn't even deny that. He didn't deny going

to the house. And he didn't deny that he told Sergio Martinez that he felt it was wrong what happened to Ibrahim and Soofi. In other words, he thought that the police did wrong in killing those two when they pulled out their weapons and started shooting.

He also told you that the defendant brushed up against his shoulder and whispered: If questioned, don't say anything about going shooting.

He didn't want anyone to know. That's another thing the defendant did not deny from the witness stand; going to Sergio Martinez and telling him to keep his mouth shut about going shooting in the desert.

Why would he need to cover that up if it was innocent?

Nicole Medellin came in and talked to you and she told you about how she spoke to the defendant back in around 2010. And he told her that U.S. soldiers all deserved to die because they were killing Muslim children overseas. That's that same selling point that ISIS and these other groups are using to recruit people to join them and go fight on behalf of the Islamic State.

The West is killing people and harming people and somebody needs to do something about it. You've heard that theme over and over again from different witnesses in this case. And here is Nicole Medellin talking about this being

that mans state of mind all the way back in 2010, years before the time period we're talking about. This is not a new phenomenon with this man.

Sergio told you about going shooting with -- he had told her about going shooting with Simpson and Ibrahim and Soofi in the desert. And his conversation with her made her fear for her childrens safety as a result of that event.

Kareem came back over to her house and Sergio's house after the attack and it was late at night. Again, corroborating what Sergio told you that the defendant came over later and said: Don't say anything about going shooting.

Let's move on. Stefan Verdugo. Here's another person who's known the defendant for a long time since he was much younger, since age 14.

You may remember Stefan. He's the guy that came in in the orange jumpsuit. Not your typical witness in a federal trial, but he came in and he talked about his time with the defendant.

He showed Kareem and Simpson how to make a small explosive device. And Kareem asked about making that bigger, making pipe bombs. He also asked about silencers. Kareem asked him about explosives to attack the Super Bowl or West Gate Mall, again, showing this intent to conduct an attack on behalf of ISIS. Not just Simpson and Soofi, but Abdul Malik Abdul Kareem.

He saw Simpson and Soofi watch those violent ISIS videos. And what did he tell you he learned from those? ISIS don't play. In other words, they're not kidding around when they say: We're coming for you. They're not kidding around when they say: If you mess with us, we'll kill you. They're for real.

He also told you that the defendant called non-Muslims "kafirs." Same thing that you heard from others in this case. And he talked about wanting to blow kafirs up and yelling "Allahu akbar" while doing it. He also recognized those guns from the Garland attack and one of the guns he recognized specifically was that .357 magnum with the little gold emblem in the handle.

And he told you that the defendant had given that gun to Ibrahim and he replaced it with a black Taurus .38 Special and you'll see that in a minute.

He told you about the videos. He said D -- that's how he knew the defendant Decarus Thomas before he changed his name to Abbuhl Kareem -- and Elton would spend a few hours.

Not every night, but every other night, he would come over and he would watch gorish videos about terrorist attacks or supposed U.S. military gunning down Muslims for no reason.

And they would watch this for like a few hours a night and they would go back and forth on what was later clarified to be a tablet computer. Again, this ties to Nicole

1 These aren't two people that hang out together. 2 And yet they're both describing that same attitude toward the 3 U.S. military. 4 Here is what he says about the Garland contest. 5 Simpson told Kareem about that contest in front of Verdugo. 6 And then later Mr. Abdul Kareem told Verdugo about plans to 7 attack that contest and that he was going to be part of that 8 attack. 9 He said: There's things that have to be done. 10 Again, somebody has to do something because of what the U.S. 11 is doing overseas. Right? 12 Verdugo told Kareem it wasn't worth his life. 13 some point later on, Kareem changed his mind and decided he 14 wasn't going to be part of it, actually go there and do it. 15 But that doesn't mean that he wasn't still part of the plan. 16 It just meant that he wasn't going to go. 17 Kareem talked to Verdugo a few days after the attack when Verdugo called him and he said the police martyred them 18 in the street for no reason. No reason? Two people pull out 19 quns in the street and open fire and killing them -- shooting 20 back and killing them is no reason? 21 22 Let's talk a little bit about corroboration with 23 Stefan Verdugo. He was the guy in the orange jumpsuit and he 24 told you there were other people being executed in orange

jumpsuits. And that matches the same descriptions you heard

25

from Juan and Carlos and also from Nathaniel Soofi when he described that Message in Blood with the men in orange jumpsuits being marched along the beach.

You also saw the Charlie Hebdo attack with Kareem,
Simpson, and Soofi. This is after the attack. This is after
the police have hunted these people down. And they were upset
because their Muslim brothers were being killed after having
slaughtered people at the Charlie Hebdo Magazine.

Ali Soofi, Nadir Soofi's brother, described the same thing, only he saw it earlier. And he saw them watching the attack and celebrating their Muslim brothers accomplishment. They had killed the people in the Charlie Hebdo Magazine and they were on the run. And so that was a time for celebrating because they were successful.

One of the things that Stefan Verdugo did was describe things from inside Mr. Abdul Kareem's residence in fairly minute detail. He described that camouflage bulletproof vest. He described ammunition, including the 12-gauge ammunition being there. He described different kinds of guns that Mr. Abdul Kareem had in his possession.

One of those guns he described was a gun-metal gray like silver, .380 pistol with a wood-grain handle. That gun wasn't found by the FBI when they searched Mr. Abdul Kareem's residence, but they did find a magazine that matches the description of that gun. That's this one here. It's Exhibit

No. 400 and that's a photograph of that.

And that's not one round inside like Mr. Abdul Kareem described. It's five rounds inside that magazine. It's not something he found sweeping out a truck. It's something that he had inside his apartment in his bedroom.

Mr. Verdugo had nothing to gain here. He got \$500 from the FBI. Why? So that he could legally drive around while trying to make recordings and making recorded phone calls. It would make sense that the FBI would not want somebody who is helping them to get pulled over for driving on a suspended license and end up getting taken into custody or get their car taken away while they're trying to help the FBI.

Nine months later when he comes in here and testifies in front of you, he doesn't owe the FBI a darn thing. He's already gotten whatever benefit he was going to get. And the same thing is true with regard to his state case. He told you there's been nothing given to him in the state case in exchange for coming over here and testifying in this case.

The only thing that he got was agents writing reports and disclosing those reports on things that they had seen that might be material to his defense. Why? Because that's a constitutional obligation that the government has to turn over that kind of material and so that happened.

What's important is it happened back in December. He came here and testified for you in the end of February.

Again, whatever benefit he was going to get, he already had.

He didn't have to come here and talk to you.

Let's go on to Ali Soofi and then, hopefully, take a break from there.

Ali Soofi lived in Simpson's and Soofi's apartment from February, 2014, to March, 2015, and moved out in April, about a month before the attack. He said the defendant frequently came over to that apartment and spent the night there on occasions sleeping on that L-shaped couch.

And he talked to you about how their feet kind of practically touched each other because they were on opposite ends of that L. He also told you the defendant came to the apartment two or three times per week in the months leading up to May 3 of 2015.

He describes the ISIS videos that they watched. He said Simpson and Soofi and the defendant were watching these ISIS videos showing people riding around in trucks shooting guns. He told you about how Ibrahim would talk about those videos to both Nadir Soofi and the defendant and would Tweet about them and talk about that.

He said he began to feel unsafe in that apartment as the talk about ISIS got more intense and he started spending more time with his girlfriend, but still was there during the week.

He also told you about those videos having been

played on that tower computer. And remember, that's hooked up to a flat screen TV in the apartment. Everybody in that apartment could see. It's not like it's this great big place. It's a one-bedroom apartment with one living room and everybody inside the apartment could see that flat screen.

Nadir, his brother, was always at the main computer chair controlling what was being watched. When the videos were playing, the defendant was saying: People need to learn their lessons. Nonbelievers, you know, will basically learn their place in this world in the end.

He also told you about seeing beheading videos being played and Ibrahim being pleased about that and the defendant and his brother Nadir likewise being pleased by what they saw. Their expressions were just like Ibrahims.

He talked to you about kafirs. That the defendant mentioned to him a couple of times about the kafirs, the nonbelievers, and told you "these people should be killed" is what the defendant said.

Again, this is somebody completely unrelated to Juan and Carlos, unrelated to Stefan Verdugo describing the same thing.

He also talked to you about Elton Simpson's Twitter usage. Only Ibrahim had a Twitter account. Nadir Soofi didn't have one. Neither did the defendant. Ibrahim used the Twitter account from that tower computer, again, connected to

the flat screen so everyone could see it.

He described a man, African-American who was from Minnesota that Ibrahim would Tweet with all the time, constantly. And then we showed him a picture. That's Mujahid Miski. That's the same person that you saw in those Twitter direct messages in Exhibit 480 that was talking back and forth to Elton Simpson and that I showed you earlier when I was talking about his commitment to the Islamic State and hijra.

He told you that Ibrahim and Mr. Abdul Kareem would sit next to each other on the couch and talk about what Ibrahim was doing on Twitter. He said Ibrahim would always lean over and show what he was Tweeting -- and this is on his phone at this point -- and there would almost be a discussion about what he was Tweeting.

He would do the same thing with my brother as well, you know, watch a specific video and then Tweet something about it and then show him.

Here is a slide from Exhibit 480. Elton Simpson on Twitter talking to that guy QaQa that he had been talking to at another point in the conversation about the price of firearms in sham, which is Syria, compared to the United States.

In this part he's talking about other things, but he says:

Bro I was just telling a bro from Philly what you

1 said. 2 That's consistent with what Ali told you about him 3 talking about what he's Tweeting about. 4 And then you have in evidence -- I think it's Exhibit 5 134, but forgive me if I'm wrong -- photographs of Elton 6 Simpson taken by the defendant on his camera -- on his cell 7 phone and recovered by the CART examiners the early morning 8 hours of February 18. That's your "bro from Philly." 9 The khalif discussion. Again, you have another 10 discussion with the defendant, Elton Simpson, and Nadir Soofi 11 about a Khalif. Who's got a Khalif? 12 He also told you that the defendant talked about 13 selling all of his possessions and moving to the Middle East. 14 Hijra. 15 He told you about the Charlie Hebdo attack. And I 16 already went through this. They looked pleased because, 17

again, these people had accomplished what they were setting out to do, which was get that message across on behalf of ISIL. Don't insult the Prophet. We'll kill you.

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

He also told you, again, this End of Times fascination and there was a constant discussion toward the end when his brother became more radical. A constant discussion of different prophesies that had already occurred, the constant worry of the different prophesies that had been foretold are happening.

Again, this is how ISIS sells itself. They are fulfilling those prophesies. They are reading them and they're selling themselves and it's fulfilling the prophesies that are going to trigger that final battle, Armageddon, and these folks wanted to be a part of it.

He also told you about money. His brother Nadir ran two businesses into the ground, the pizza business as well as the cleaning business, because he was too focused on the Islamic radical side of things and not on running his business. And the only way they got by was with financial help from their father.

He told you the same thing about Ibrahim. Ibrahim had been working parttime consistently, but after a while it became nothing, almost a couple of days here and there.

Neither of these guys had the kind of money that it took to buy a gun for \$700.

Even the defendant admitted that Ibrahim had stopped working. He told you about Ibrahims AK, that he got it sometime four months or so after Ali moved in the apartment. That he didn't have the money to buy that gun. And he told you that the defendant provided the money to buy that gun.

Nadirs AK. He told you the same thing about that.

Nadir came home with a full body AK about four months before the Garland attack. That's corroborated by those texts that you saw during the trial when the LG 440 phone, the one found

in Garland, was being used to ask questions of prospective sellers about whether they had their AKs for sale and discussing price. Those were in January of 2015. That ties directly to what Ali told you.

Nadir told Ali that he borrowed \$700 from the defendant to buy the gun and the defendant was present in the room when that happened.

He told you about them going shooting in the desert; twice with Simpson and Soofi, one time was north towards

Sedona, and they took those AK rifles. The defendant handled both of those firearms. He told you about them cleaning the firearms. After that first time they went shooting, the defendant was showing Simpson and Soofi how to take them apart, how to clean them, how to lubricate them, and how to put them back together. Why? Because he knew that they needed to know how to do that in order to have their guns be functional. He was overseeing.

And Ali told you Ibrahim and his brother Nadir had no training at all with guns. Again, describing that proper cleaning procedure. Not leaving grease on the guns, not completely removing the grease from the sliding parts, and cleaning the barrel properly using the brush to clean the barrel so that you don't damage it.

Lets take a pause here.

THE COURT: Thank you, Mr. Koehler.

1 Ladies and gentlemen, we'll take our morning break at 2 this time. We will reconvene at about ten minutes to 11:00. 3 You are, again, reminded of the admonition you are 4 not to discuss the case among yourselves or form any 5 conclusions about it until you have heard the rest of the 6 closing arguments of counsel and begun your deliberations. I want to also make a special request of all of our 7 spectators here today. All of my jurors are wearing juror 8 badges. You may encounter some of them. You may be talking 9 10 about the case because you're not prohibited from doing so. 11 But please, if you see any of these people with their 12 juror badges on, or even if they don't have their juror badges on, please stop discussing the case so that there is no 13 14 possibility that they overhear any of your discussion about the case. 15 16 I don't think that I have to warn you about not 17 contacting or trying to speak to any of my jurors. I'm sure you know very well that that is also prohibited. 18 We will reconvene, ladies and gentlemen, in 15 19 minutes. 20 Court is in recess. 21 22 (Recess taken at 10:34 a.m.; resumed at 10:51 a.m.) 23 THE COURT: Thank you, ladies and gentlemen. Please 24 sit down. The record will show the presence of the jury, 25 counsel, and the defendant.

1 Mr. Koehler, you may continue your closing argument. 2 MR. KOEHLER: Thank you, Your Honor. 3 We left off at the point in which I was about to 4 explain to you how the defense witnesses also support the 5 governments case in this case. 6 Let's talk first about AK Wahid, a friend of the defendant's and a friend of Ibrahims. 7 8 Mr. Wahid came in here and under oath told you from the witness stand that Abdul Malik Abdul Kareem told him about 9 10 Simpson and Soofi planning to light up a Marine base. He told 11 you he had heard the same thing directly from them, but that 12 the defendant came to him and told him that Simpson and Soofi 13 had talked to him about doing that. 14 Now, of course, the defendant said that it was AK 15 that told him about this attack and that he didn't really --16 it was vague and he didn't really understand it and we'll come 17 back to that in a little bit. He was also present with the defendant and Ibrahim 18 when the defendant bought that Taurus .38 Special. 19 20 the qun that came from Sean Raper. Sean Raper was the quy that came in here and told you how he had the gun listed on 21 22 Craigslist and the defendant contacted him and they met in a 23 parking lot. 24 And when the defendant bought the gun from him, 25 whether it was \$300 or \$350 is really irrelevant. The thing

that was relevant to Raper at the time was that the defendant had this great big old wad of cash in his hands. And how nobody in their right mind goes to a transaction like that involving a firearm exchange with a whole bunch of money on them. That's a very easy way for someone to get robbed. So it makes sense that that would stand out to him.

In addition, he told you that the defendant said he was in the market for more guns. Who was with him? AK and Ibrahim.

Also, this gun matches Stefan Verdugo's description of the defendant getting a new gun after he gave Ibrahim the .357 with the little gold emblem in the handle.

And it also dovetails with the notion that Nadir Soofi was seeking to buy an AK rifle in January, which is after this, of course, but it shows, hey, Abdul Malik Abdul Kareem in the market for more guns shopping with Ibrahim. And lo and behold, who is looking for a gun as well? Nadir Soofi.

There's that .357 from Garland. If you look in this lower-left corner right here, you see that little gold emblem just like Stefan Verdugo described. Over here, that's the .38 Special that Mr. Abdul Kareem had in his truck; all black, a Taurus, just like Stefan Verdugo described.

Let's talk about Nathaniel Soofi who came in as a defense witness. He stayed at that apartment on most weekends and stayed over on Saturdays. That's the same night the

defendant's brother James Sampson came in here and told you that the defendant usually spent at his place. So it would make sense that Nathaniel Soofi would never see the defendant spend the night at the Simpson and Soofi apartment. Why? Because he wasn't there on the nights that the defendant would be there.

He told you about seeing ISIS execution videos on Nadirs computer and he saw them when he was alone with Nadir. He didn't see those videos with Ibrahim and he didn't see those with the defendant because Nadir was showing those to him just the two of them.

He also knew about the Garland contest. And he knew that the planning for that started all the way back in February. He described how it was cold outside and it was still February at that point in time.

Nadir told his son about the plan to attack the contest and he overheard Nadir and Ibrahim talking about it. He didn't overhear Nadir and Ibrahim and Malik talking about it. There's no doubt about that. But that doesn't mean that Malik wasn't part of the plan, because Malik usually wasn't there when Nathaniel was.

Let's talk about corroboration for a minute.

Ali Soofi didn't know Stefan Verdugo. Didn't know
Juan. Didn't know Carlos. In fact, he didn't know Sergio
Martinez either.

But Juan and Carlos and Stefan Verdugo all describe the same types of videos and the same types of behavior among Abdul Malik Abdul Kareem, Elton Simpson, and Nadir Soofi that Ali described. And he doesn't even know them.

Ali described Nadir as making soup on the night of May 1st, the night before they left. And lo and behold, AK Wahid comes in and testifies to you that on the night of May 1st, Nadir brought him soup. What a coincidence.

Let's talk about other corroboration in this case.

Abdullah Mubarak.

Verdugo had talked about hearing the word "Khalifah."

Only Verdugo is not a Muslim. He's more of a street kind of guy. And who does he think Khalifah is? A musician. A rapper.

Abdullah Mubarak explained his arguments with the defendant about the existence of a Khalifah in todays world. And he had to call his son to explain "there is no Khalifah" to the defendant. So, again, the Khalifah discussion was something that's going on and it makes every bit of sense that it would happen in the Cochise residence when Stefan Verdugo was there and corroborated by Abdullah Mubarak. Only ISIL claims to have a Khalifah.

The defendant also admitted in Exhibit 422 -- that's one of his post-arrest interview videos -- that he knew that ISIL is the group that claims to have a Khalifah.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Again, Carlos and Juan, not in contact with Verdugo after the contest. Remember? Verdugo is not living there anymore. And not only that, but Verdugo got arrested by the FBI -- the agency that he's supposedly favoring somehow over the defendant -- in California just a few weeks after the attack took place. So these kids had no contact with him and yet they described the same things. Again, Ali didn't know these kids. Now, I want to break and switch to the document camera for you in a minute and you'll have these on the JERS video. Let me switch to the document camera, please. This is Exhibit 291. And you'll have a much better view of this when you're in the room. The thing I want you to focus on is what's in the background here. This is an execution being carried out in front of children. The same thing occurs in Exhibit 293, an execution in front of children. Why are they doing this? Why is Nadir Soofi showing his son these videos? Why is this man showing Juan and Carlos those videos? It's so that they can indoctrinate these children and turn them into the future soldiers of ISIL. That's why. Let's talk about joining and aiding the conspiracies.

Again, he was pushy with Sergio to take Elton Simpson and

Nadir Soofi out to the desert to shoot. He told you from the witness stand that Elton was pushy with him. And it makes every bit of sense that he would have, again, been pushy with Sergio.

He taught them how to disassemble, clean, lubricate, and reassemble those firearms. He may not have been up to James' standards, but he certainly learned from James that he didn't want to leave too much oil on the outside of the gun; that it needed to be lubricated, but perhaps not as much as the defendant wanted those guns to be lubricated.

The next thing is, remember, Sergio, again, on cross explaining that a gun had jammed when Elton Simpson and the defendant went to his mothers house to shoot? Again, the defendant knew that Elton Simpson needed to learn how to do this the right way or his gun was going to jam and it wasn't going to function when he conducted an attack.

Let's talk about physical evidence in this case.

Remember the ammunition that we talked about earlier?

That .38 Special ammunition that fits both in a .357 magnum as well as in a .38 Special pistol? You have Richard Henderson from PMC Ammunition testify about how that particular ammunition came in these battle packs.

That's that bag right there on the table in front of you. And in evidence is a photo of that bag sitting on the ground in Garland filled with that .545 ammunition that was

1 for the AK-74. 2 So they took the boxes out of that bag of the .38 Special ammo and they put that ammunition in that bag and took 3 4 it with them to Texas. 5 Kareem -- Mr. Abdul Kareem had two boxes of that in 6 his apartment. Remember, it came in a six-pack. Simpson and 7 Soofi had one box in their apartment. And then they had a box 8 with them in Garland, Texas. Five rounds of that ammunition. And that's this exhibit right here with the individual rounds, 9 10 Exhibit No. 13. Those are the rounds that came out of the 11 .357 that Elton Simpson had in his pocket that was cut away. 12 There's the bag. There's the lot number on the 13 ammunition from the Simpson and Soofi apartment. 14 ammunition from the Garland scene is in the lower left. 15 then the ones on the lower right are from Mr. Abdul Kareem's apartment. Lot number matches on every single one of those. 16 17 Here is what Mr. Kareem had to say about that ammunition. 18 (Playing an excerpt of Exhibit 428 to the jury.) 19 MR. KOEHLER: It wasn't for him. It was for me. 20 Adamant about that. Yet when he took the stand and testified 21 22 in front of you the day before yesterday and the day before that, he told you that was a split purchase. That they both 23

But that's not what he said in his post-arrest

paid half for that purchase.

24

25

1 interview. "It was for me," he said. 2 There's other ammunition that matches in this case 3 that hasn't really been talked about very much, and that is, 4 the Perfecta 9 millimeter ammunition that was found at the 5 Garland scene, as well as a box of it in Abdul Kareem's 6 apartment locked away. 7 On the table there you see the whole box from the 8 apartment. And then also on the table you see the remnants of that box. The one from the apartment is Exhibit 117. The one 9 10 from the scene is Exhibit 59. 11 Now, if you look closely, right here you can see it 12 says two box -- or 250 X -- meaning 50 shells -- of 9 13 millimeter ammunition for 1995. Two boxes. Here's one box in 14 the apartment. Here's another box from the scene. 15 The box from the scene is destroyed, so you don't 16 have the lot number from that box, but you do have the bar 17 code and it's exactly the same between the two bar codes. Is that just a coincidence? 18 Let's talk for a minute about Mr. Abdul Kareem's 19 paranoia. He thought there was a tracking device in his car 20 and he thought that Simpson was an FBI informant. And then he 21 told you that Simpson thought that he was an FBI informant. 22 23 You heard from Amber Pluff, Stefan Verdugo's 24 ex-girlfriend, that Mr. Abdul Kareem always seemed paranoid 25 and he had to go because the Feds were listening.

Carlos also told you the defendant was worried all the time about the FBI watching and you heard that elsewhere as well.

He had five weeks after this attack to clean up. And who knows how long before the attack, once he decided that he wasn't actually going to go.

Five weeks to purge overtly jihadist materials, whether they're books or other literature, the The Defense of the Muslim Lands book that was found in Garland. Five weeks to get rid of overtly jihadist CDs like The Battle of Hearts and Minds and five weeks to clean up his computer devices.

He tried to wipe that Lenovo laptop in 2014 before giving it to Sergio Martinez. And he told you that he burned that 2 gigabyte thumb drive; burned it up in a barbecue.

He also cleaned his Google Search History in 2015 multiple times.

Agent Whitson testified about things that were in the history when he executed the first search warrant on Mr. Abdul Kareems Gmail account that weren't there the second time that he executed the search.

And there were things in the Acer Aspire in its

Search History that had been accessed from the Google account that, likewise, were not there when they did the first search warrant on the Gmail account.

So, again, Mr. Abdul Kareem is, in fact, cleaning his

computers, cleaning his Gmail account.

And in case you hear an argument that this isn't a guy who is sophisticated enough to do this, remember, this is not only a guy who's cleaned his Gmail account and has the tools to clean his computer, but he also knows how to tether that computer to a cell phone. He's not somebody who is completely unsophisticated when it comes to computers.

Again, one of the things that he deleted from that computer was that Flames of War video. The only trace of that video was in the unallocated space and in the Windows System Recovery Restore Point, a place that was too deep for him to figure out how to get to. But it was deleted and it had been there before.

And you have that whole video in evidence. He had the tool with which to perform this cleanup. That's Exhibit 200, that Hirens boot CD, the one that says Hirens 15.1 on it. And you heard from Mr. Evans, the CART examiner from the FBI, about some of the tools and that CD.

One of them is the program called Shredder. And here's what it says: Shredder allows you to erase files in such a way that it is impossible to recover them by software or hardware means.

So he had exactly the right tool that he needed to take those things off of his computer and he had five weeks within which to do it.

```
1
               Let's talk for a minute about credibility.
 2
      Mr. Sampson, when asked if it would surprise him about his
 3
      brother wiring money to people when borrowing money from him,
 4
      says:
 5
               Surprise is such a vaque word to me.
 6
               Is "surprise" really that vague?
 7
               He also said:
               I wouldn't say that I -- that he didn't know the
 8
      defendant had been convicted of a felony.
 9
               In other words, he claimed that he told the FBI that
10
      he did know that the defendant had a felony.
11
12
          (Playing an excerpt of Exhibit 606 to the jury.)
13
               MR. KOEHLER: There you have it. That's exactly what
14
      he told the FBI.
               If I knew he had that felony, he wouldn't have had a
15
16
          But he told you on the witness stand that he told the
17
      FBI that he did know he had a felony.
               One thing he did tell you was that the defendant
18
      always used too much oil when cleaning guns.
19
20
               And then, of course, the wiring of money. And you
      saw the money wiring receipts where the defendant was sending
21
22
      money to other people in significant dollar amounts; $500
23
      here, $700 there. The defendant deposited $10,000 in cash
24
      into his BMO Harris bank account. He wasn't hurting for
25
      money.
```

Let's talk for a minute about the experts in this case.

Dr. Sageman came in here and talked to you about his point of view on things. But one thing became clear very early on, and that is, he didn't know a heck of a lot about ISIS. He didn't follow their propaganda or their recruitment efforts. He didn't recognize their materials and the relevance that those materials have to their recruitment strategies.

His expertise was in al-Qa'ida and what attracted people to al-Qa'ida, not ISIS; not ISISs online propaganda or its recruiting strategies.

Not only that, but he didn't bother listening to the totality of the al-Awlaki recordings that were discussed in this trial.

Look at the other side of things. Mr. Kohlmann devotes most of his time to terrorist propaganda and recruiting efforts online. That's what he does. He spends his whole time in his life online following what they're doing and figuring out where that's going next.

The same thing is true of Dr. Vidino. He dedicates the majority of his time to the study of ISIS and has published a seminal paper on ISISs recruiting strategy and their use of Twitter to further their efforts.

Speaking of Dr. Sageman, he claimed that the

Hearts -- that The Hearts and Minds recording is not a violent recording. This, again, is something that was in the Search History from the Lenovo laptop and is Exhibit 164. (Playing an excerpt of Exhibit 164 to the jury.) MR. KOEHLER: Facing death with a smile, just like Elton Simpson did when he got out of the car on May 3rd of 2015. You heard from Bruce Joiner describing how he thought at first this must be a prank because this guy was grinning at him. And then he saw the gun come up and realized that it wasn't. We'll stop here for a minute. This is a case that involved a lot of digital evidence, as well as the physical evidence and the witnesses who came in here and testified. And the reality of this case is that the digital evidence is completely unnecessary for you to reach a conclusion of guilt

17 in this case.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

You have the testimony of all the different witnesses in this case about what was going on inside the Simpson and Soofi apartment with the defendant present. You have the witness testimony about what was happening inside the defendant's residence and the things that he was doing and saying to people and that were said to him in other peoples presence.

To know exactly what was going on, you have the ISIS

flags, all of the weapons, the books and literature that the two shooters in Garland, Simpson and Soofi, had with them.

That, alone, is enough to support a guilty verdict in this case. But like they say in the infomercials:

Wait. There's more.

This digital evidence in this case isn't just something to deepen and broaden your understanding of the scope of the conspiracy, the fact that they wanted to travel to the Islamic State and fight. It's not just evidence of their desire to attack other targets like the ISHD, the Islamic State Hacking Division target list of a hundred service members.

It goes beyond that. It corroborates what you have heard from these children. These children describe watching beheading videos and other things that they've seen. And lo and behold, this is exactly what you find on the computers, those things, the al-Awlaki lectures that you heard that they were listening to and so forth.

So you've got these devices that Simpson and Soofi had: The Samsung Galaxy Smartphone, that was Simpson's phone, the tower desktop computer that was Soofi's, the Dell Inspiron laptop computer that was Soofi's, the Samsung Galaxy Smartphone that was Soofi's, and then the two LG 440 -- they're kind of drop phones -- those little flip phones, one in the car in Garland and one in the apartment.

1	Without a doubt, these things were replete with
2	jihadist material and evidence of Simpson's and Soofi's
3	intentions. But they also contained things that corroborate
4	what you have heard from the witnesses in the courtroom here,
5	and that is, by and large the purpose of bringing the evidence
6	from those items your way.
7	Mr. Abdul Kareem's devices. He had the Lenovo laptop
8	that had the thumb drive attached to it. He had the Acer
9	Aspire computer, his Maxwest Gravity 5.5 Smartphone, and his
10	Nextbook tablet.
11	The Lenovo laptop had that Security Intelligence
12	Course from the Global Islamic Media Front in the Recycle
13	Bin. In other words, somebody had deleted it but not finished
14	doing so.
15	That's a How-To Guide on operational security for
16	people in organizations on how to avoid detection by Western
17	intelligence in law enforcement.
18	You also had on the Lenovo laptop Internet searches
19	for jihadist audio and video files such as the Battle of
20	Hearts and Minds, Anwar al-Awlaki;
21	His lecture on Brutality Toward the Muslims;
22	The Arrashud lecture And Incite The Believers;
23	The Mujahideen Bagram Escape video showing people
24	escaping from the Bagram Prison;
25	And then the Kalamullah.com link for other al-Awlaki

```
1
      lectures.
 2
               And, again, Kalamullah.com is a jihadi website for
      promoting the global salafi jihad as Dr. Sageman described
 3
 4
      it.
 5
               You also have the thumb drive.
 6
               S&I.pdf, again, that Security And Intelligence
 7
      Course;
 8
               Training That Makes Civilians Acceptable;
 9
               A Treatise on the Legal Status of Using Weapons of
10
      Mass Destruction Against the Infidels;
11
               To Make It Known To People...and Not to Hide It, by
12
      Anwar al-Awlaki;
13
               The Hatred of the Juffar;
14
               Inspire Magazine, Issues 8 and 9.
15
               This is something that Mr. Abdul Kareem admitted to
16
      Detective Nash that he had watched or looked at.
17
      Magazine. He said Elton Simpson didn't show that to me. I
      looked at it on my own.
18
19
               The next thing is:
               The Ruling on the Dispossessing the Disbelievers
20
21
      Wealth in Dar al-Harb.
22
               And that ties to the Karem Fabian insurance claim.
23
      And you have that document in evidence. It's Exhibit 181.
24
      encourage you to take a look at that and tell me if the notion
25
      of committing fraud inside the United States against
```

Westerners to support jihad is not consistent with exactly what the defendant did when he slapped the trunk of Ms. Fabian's car and then claim that she hit him.

He didn't fall down. The records from John C.

Lincoln the very next day, the day that he claimed that he couldn't get up, he couldn't move his hip, he couldn't move his leg; the records from the hospital, that day's visit, no objective symptoms, normal range of motion; the x-rays, no evidence of injury.

The only place that supports his claim of injury is the chiropractic clinic. Does the chiropractor go and talk to the person that was on the other side of that? No. You have to take his word for it.

Even if they found an injury, it doesn't mean that it came from that.

The Acer Aspire had that ISIS Flames of War video on it. Again, just like Ms. Vaughan testified, the person who pulled that video up clicked through five screens in order to get to see that. They had to do age verification, controversial video, verification. Say --

Yes. Yes. I want to see this video.

-- before they got to it. That's the exact same thing the defense expert testified about when he got up on the witness stand. It had the five Anwar al-Awlaki lectures, and, again, another lecture from the Jamaican Sheikh, Sheikh Faisal

who is another extremist radical cleric.

The Nextbook tablet. Not only did it have those End Of Times imagery items that we talked about before. But it also had a thumbnail photo of Hakimullah Mehsud who is the former leader of the Taliban in Pakistan and was killed in November of 2013, and it also had a screen capture from that ISIS Message in Blood to the Kurdish Alliance. And that was an execution video in front of the Great Mosque in Mosul.

Now, you heard from Agent Whitson that video was released August 28, 2014, and the other photo was of a person that was killed in November, 2013.

Does it seem logical to you that these items would be on a tablet computer that wasn't even started up until May 28, 2015 -- or May 22nd of 2015, being originated from a news site like CNN?

Why would a story of Hakimullah Mehsud being killed in November, 2013, be newsworthy in mid 2015? Why would this Message in Blood video released by ISIS months and months earlier be a newsworthy item at that point in time in the West?

It doesn't make sense. The only thing that would make sense is if the defendant went somewhere and saw those things on a site that would promote those kind of things.

Not a news site. A Jihadi site.

He also has the eBooks, the British Government in

Jihad and the Origins of The Islamic State.

This is a fascination. It's something that he couldn't stay away from for whatever reason. He's fascinated with the End of Time scenario that ISIS is selling. He's fascinated with people like Hakimullah Mehsud and the execution videos and he's fascinated with the Origins Of The Islamic State.

Let's circle back here for a minute.

We have two conspiracies here. One is the "material support" conspiracy; and the second is the "interstate transportation of firearms."

The "interstate transportation of firearms" conspiracy is one that had to have begun later, no sooner than when the Garland, Texas, contest was announced. So it had to have begun sometime in February or later.

The "firearms transportation" conspiracy requires an agreement between two or more people to commit transportation of firearms in interstate commerce with intent to commit a felony; in other words, traveling across state lines with guns intending to commit murder and/or aggravated assault in Texas.

It can be proven by direct or circumstantial evidence. I would submit to you that we have proven this beyond a reasonable doubt by direct evidence, just by virtue of the fact that Elton Simpson and Nadir Soofi went to Garland from Phoenix armed and opened fire when they got there.

Abdul Malik Abdul Kareem joined the conspiracy. We have shown you all of the evidence of the different witnesses that put him knowing about this contest, knowing what the defendants wanted to do, and wanting to be a part of it.

The agreement itself is the crime. Again, the object

The agreement itself is the crime. Again, the object crime need not actually be committed. And I submit to you, they tried. They just didn't succeed.

The evidence of the transportation. Part of the agreement is very simple. They traveled to Garland while armed. They fired shots.

Now, this conspiracy -- and, again, you had Stefan Verdugo's testimony that the defendant was actually intending to be a part of that at one point in time -- this conspiracy differs from the "material support" conspiracy in that it requires the commission of an overt act.

That's not in the elements of the "material support" conspiracy. I would submit to you, again, in this case you have Elton Simpson and Nadir Soofi practicing shooting with the defendant, traveling to Texas with their firearms, they discussed this attack and the defendant hosted them to do so in his home, and they opened fire in Garland, Texas.

Overt acts all over the place.

The next charge is that Aiding and Abetting the Transportation of Firearms Interstate With Intent to Commit a Felony.

Again, the defendant knew what they wanted to do. He knew what their plan was. And he encouraged them and he helped them and he had the intent of helping them to succeed. One of the things that he did to help ensure that they would succeed was to teach them how to clean the firearms.

The next charge is the false statements to the FBI.

The defendant made false statements to the FBI. He acted

deliberately with knowledge that the statement was untrue and

his conduct was unlawful.

Here's in that little warning from Agent Simpson to the defendant: You know it's a crime to lie to the FBI.

Because that's where this is relevant. The defendant admitted from the stand even that Agent Whitson warned him in his May 5 interview that it was illegal to lie to the FBI. So he knew that lying to the FBI was unlawful.

And finally, the statement had to be material.

Again, May 5, 2015, two days after the attack. All statements about where Simpson and Soofi were, how they got those guns, and so forth, are material to that investigation.

Agent Whitson and Detective Nash interviewed the defendant together on May 5th, 2015. Important to remember. The defendant wasn't even a target of the investigation at that time. Everybody was being asked questions about these people.

Why? Because the agents wanted to figure out what

1	happened and how.
2	The recording failed. But they wrote a report almost
3	immediately thereafter while it was still fresh in their minds
4	and using notes that they had created during the interview.
5	The defendant in that interview denied shooting in
6	the desert with Simpson and Soofi.
7	He denied that Simpson and Soofi had fired those
8	assault rifles before.
9	He denied knowing of the attack in advance.
10	And he denied even knowing of the contest until after
11	the attack.
12	I have already described what all the witnesses said
13	about the defendant's knowledge of that contest and how he
14	planned at some point to be a part of attacking it.
15	He repeated those lies again on June 10 in his
16	interview. He told the agents: Until this happened, I didn't
17	hear, I didn't know anything with that contest.
18	So that corroborates the fact that he said that
19	before and showed that the agents were, in fact, telling the
20	truth about what he said in that May 5 interview.
21	He testified here in court as well. He didn't know
22	of the attack plan and he didn't know about the contest until
23	after the attack.
24	But he also lied to you while he was on the witness
25	stand. He claimed that he split that .38 Special ammunition

1 purchase with Elton Simpson. Again, Exhibit 428. 2 We bought some ammunition and that was for me. wasn't for him. It was for me. 3 4 Adamant. 5 He also claimed that he thought his felonies were old 6 and they didn't count anymore, which is not an excuse, by the 7 way. But in his interview he tells the agents: I'm not a felon. That was under Decarus Thomas. 8 Μy name is not Decarus Thomas. My name is not Decarus Thomas. 9 10 This is not an honest man. Another lie from the witness stand. He claimed the 11 12 first time he went to the Simpson and Soofi apartment was in 13 February, 2015, because his water had to be turned off due to 14 a leak in his home. 15 You heard from Ms. Vaughan when she testified from 16 the witness stand. She found videos related to a water leak 17 in the defendant's Acer Aspire laptop computer. And lo and behold, the video that she found was shot in August of 2014, 18 six months before February, 2015. 19 20 That's when he had the leak. That's when he had to have his water turned off. There were no other videos in 2015 21 22 of such a recording. There were no messages or anything else 23 related to a water leak in 2015. 24 The defendant also told you from the witness stand 25 that somebody called him and told him that Simpson and Soofi

1 bought AK rifles. And then later he said, no, no. It was two different calls; one for Simpson, one for Soofi. 2 3 He either heard from Simpson and Soofi about plans to 4 shoot up a Marine base, as was testified to by Abdul Khabir 5 Hyman, or he heard from AK Hyman -- or AK Wahid, excuse me --6 that Simpson and Soofi had told Wahid about that. 7 So one way or another, he knew that Simpson and Soofi had either discussed with him or discussed with AK intention 8 to attack a Marine base. 9 10 This was vaque and it wasn't important or relevant. 11 What person in their right mind hears somebody who is their 12 close friend talking about attacking a Marine base or hears of 13 them planning to do it and then hears in a phone call that 14 they have acquired an AK rifle and doesn't have alarm bells go 15 That's relevant. That's important. 16 One more lie. When he was on the witness stand the 17 other day, the defendant told you that he didn't use that Acer laptop between somewhere in October or November of 2014 18 through the end of May until his arrest in June of 2015. 19 20 He told you that something was wrong with it. It wasn't working and so he wasn't using it. 21 22 Members of the jury --23 Can I switch to the document camera, please? 24 This is Exhibit 481. This is something that Agent

Meshinsky talked to you about how he exported this item from

25

1 the Acer Aspire laptop. This is the System Access Log. It's 2 wireless access from the Acer Aspire laptop. And the first 3 entry date on here is 2015 0122 at 62231. 4 In other words, January 22 of 2015, the Acer Aspire 5 laptop was turned on. The name of the computer is Git PC and 6 it accessed the Gravity 5.5 Smartphone. 7 So that computer was on and Abdul Kareem had his 8 wireless phone in range of that computer tethered to it so that it could access the Internet. That's January 22nd. 9 10 This is about eight or nine pages here, somewhere in that neighborhood, but let's just fast forward to the end of 11 12 May. 13 You have May 27th. The same thing. Connecting to 14 the Gravity, the Git PC. And, again, on May 30, 2015. 15 When Ms. Vaughan was testifying on the stand, she 16 told you how she reviewed the Internet Search History from 17 that computer and that computer was active all the way through the end of May, 2015, and this document establishes that. 18 19 So if we can switch back, please. When the defendant told you from the witness stand 20 under oath that he wasn't using that computer during that time 21 22 frame, he was lying to you. 23 Why would he lie to you about that? Because he knows

interview. Only someone who's guilty gives false testimony

what was found. Only someone who is quilty lies during an

24

25

```
1
      under oath. He lied in his interviews and he lied on the
 2
      witness stand, and he is, in fact, guilty here.
 3
               Something to keep in mind. No one from the
 4
      government, not Ms. Brook in opening, not me during my
 5
      closing, and not one single witness from the government has
 6
      testified and called that man "the master mind."
 7
               Nobody has called him that. The only person that
 8
      used that word was Mr. Maynard during his opening statement.
 9
               Okay. He's not a master mind, but he is a motivator,
10
      a trainer, and a bank roller. And you should find him guilty.
11
               Thank you.
12
               THE COURT: Thank you, Mr. Koehler.
13
               Mr. Maynard, you may --
14
               MR. MAYNARD: Can we take an early lunch?
15
               THE COURT: Yes.
                                 I gave -- when trying to set up the
16
      schedule yesterday, I gave Mr. Maynard the option. And I said
17
      if it's any time after 11:30, we could take an early lunch
      break and then come back so that his closing would not have to
18
      be interrupted by a long period of time.
19
               So let's take a one-hour -- well, let's take a
20
      57-minute lunch break. Let's reconvene at 12:30, ladies and
21
22
      gentlemen.
23
               Again, I want to remind you of the admonition that
24
      you still cannot discuss the case among yourselves. Of
25
      course, can you not discuss the case with anyone else.
```

1 Your deliberations will begin sometime later today. 2 And until then, please do not form any conclusions about the case or discuss the case with each other. 3 Court is in recess until 12:30. 5 (Recess taken at 11:33 a.m.; resumed at 12:30 p.m.) THE COURT: Good afternoon, ladies and gentlemen. 6 7 Please sit down. The record will show the presence of the jury, counsel, and the defendant. 8 Mr. Maynard, you may make your closing argument. 9 10 CLOSING ARGUMENT: DEFENSE 11 MR. MAYNARD: Thank you, Your Honor. 12 And thank you, ladies and gentlemen of the jury. I agree with the government in one thing, and that is 13 14 that this has been a long trial. Mary, Abdul Malik, and I 15 want to thank you for your patience and for your attention that you paid in this case because there's an awful lot of 16 17 evidence. All this evidence wasn't really necessary. What the 18 government has done in this case is tried to deal with your 19 fears, the fears that we have about the unknown, about 20 al-Qa'ida, about ISIS, about homegrown terrorists. 21 22 And they've paraded in front of you all of these 23 guns, all of these weapons, all of this material, pictures, 24 and videos and stories of people being burned alive, having 25 their heads cut off. And, yeah, it's all happening and it's

horrifying and terrifying. But this case is about is about whether my client, Abdul Malik, conspired with Soofi and Simpson to do what they did.

There's no question there was a conspiracy in this case. Simpson and Soofi were in a conspiracy. They decided that they were going to travel across state lines and attempt to commit murder and assault people in Texas.

There's no question that Officer Stevens was the kind of police officer we would all like to have in our community.

He did exactly what we want a police officer to do. In fact, he went well beyond the call of duty.

The idea that he is standing there, a motorcycle police officer, and two guys drive up in a car, stop, and get out with automatic weapons, and he has the wherewithal and state of mind to pull his gun and shoot those two before they do any damage or harm to anybody, they should be making a statue to him. I mean, that's the kind of police officer we all want in our community.

But this case is about the government deciding they need to find somebody else because the government messed up in this case. And Agent Whitson told you at the very beginning: Simpson was a convicted felon. He had lied to the FBI.

People believed that he was a terrorist. He should have been watched closer. Nobody but nobody seems to have gone to his apartment after he had been convicted back in 2011.

But the FBI seems to have known sometime on May 2nd or May 3rd, at least, at least as of May 3rd, that he was traveling to Dallas, Texas, or Garland, Texas, to commit an act of terror.

They sent his picture. They sent information concerning what the car looked like. And it did no good. They were embarrassed by this. So they went out and they started looking. And they did the right thing. Was there anybody else involved? Was this just two people? Or were there more?

But what happened is is after they interview Stefan Verdugo, my client becomes the target and all the resources, everything else, is geared towards looking at and convicting him. Not getting to the truth, not getting to what really happened, but let's get a conviction.

That's not what our justice system is about here in this country. Our justice system is supposed to be based upon going out, gathering the evidence, determining if a crime has been committed, determining who committed the crime, and then prosecuting them.

It's not a matter, as you were being told, "our witness" or "their witness." These are witnesses to the event, whether they're put on by the government or they're put on by the defense. Those weren't my witnesses. Those were the witnesses that were out there that should have been put on

1 by the government to tell you what this case was about. And the government failed to put on an awful lot of 2 witnesses in this case because they're not -- the government 3 4 isn't concerned with finding the truth. The government is 5 concerned with getting a conviction. 6 And you know what? This isn't a game. It's not who 7 wins and who loses. That's not what this is supposed to be 8 about. There's a mans life that's at stake. 9 It's not: Let me marshal the evidence to support my 10 case. 11 It's: Let me give the evidence to the jury, to the 12 citizens of this country, and let them decide who's guilty. 13 That didn't happen here. That's why we had to bring 14 in 13 witnesses in this case. 15 I'm going to spend a moment with you just looking at 16 the jury instructions. The Court has gone through them, but I want to focus on a couple. 17 One is on page 12. Look, this is concerning 18 Conspiracy in Count 1. Was there a conspiracy? Absolutely, 19 20 there was a conspiracy. Simpson and Soofi were in a 21 conspiracy. 22 The real question is Two: The defendant became a 23 member of the conspiracy knowing of at least one of the 24 objects and intending to help accomplish it. 25 That's the issue you have to decide. The rest of

this stuff you really don't. That's the ultimate issue here.

Did he become a member of that conspiracy?

Looking at page 14 on Count 5. Again, number Two:

The defendant became a member of the conspiracy knowing of its unlawful object and intending to help accomplish it.

That's the issue you have to decide. This other stuff, they're the elements of the crime, but there's no question Soofi and Simpson did them. There really isn't. That's the issue.

Look at the conspiracy statute on page 17. This is awful important because the Judge has instructed you that the conspiracy is a form of a partnership. But just -- it's not enough, however, that they simply met, discussed matters of common interest, acted in similar ways or perhaps helped one another. I mean, the government wants to say that because my client went out shooting in the desert sometime in January, that promoted the conspiracy.

The Garland contest hadn't even been announced by then. It didn't get announced until February 11th. This conspiracy is concerning going to Garland, Texas. Read the instructions carefully. It's about going to Texas to commit an act of murder or attempted murder.

Also, the government has instructed you that, "One becomes a member of the conspiracy by willfully participating in the unlawful plan..." It goes on, "On the other hand, one

who has no knowledge of a conspiracy, but happens to act in a way that furthers some object or purpose of the conspiracy, does not thereby become a conspirator. Similarly, a person does not become a conspirator merely by associating with one or more persons who are conspirators, nor merely by knowing that a conspiracy exists."

There were lots of people that testified here that knew that Simpson and Soofi were becoming different. They were becoming more radical. Their form of Islam was different than other people's. We had Mr. Mubarak come in. My client testified. We had a number of folks that came in and testified about that.

The same thing with aiding and abetting. The question becomes, "The defendant aided, counseled, commanded, induced or procured that person in committing the crime of conspiracy."

"The defendant acted with the intent to facilitate the conspiracy."

He has to know what they're going to do. There's no evidence that he knew what they were going to do. There's no evidence that anybody knew exactly what they were going to do except for one person, Nathan Soofi, the little boy who came in here. And we'll talk about him later because he becomes very important.

It helps to counter his uncles testimony, but he also

tells you that he told the government this and he told Agent Whitson and these prosecutors that he knew that his dad was going to Texas.

And when I asked Agent Whitson on cross-examination:

Did anybody other than Carlos and Juan and Verdugo

ever tell you that they knew that there was going to be this

Muhammad Drawing Contest in Garland, Texas, before the event?

He said: No.

Yet three weeks earlier in their offices Nathaniel Soofi had told them that he knew about it. But they didn't put him on the stand. And you've got to sit there and wonder why. Was this a search for the truth? If it was a search for the truth, why didn't the government put him on?

Count 2 is on aiding and abetting. The question is:

Did my client know? And the question is he did not -- or the answer is he did not.

Now, let me get to the easy one, Count 4, Felon in Possession. My client had two guns. My client had two felony convictions. He didn't have a right to have the guns. He might have been a knucklehead because he thought that if he changed his name, he wasn't the same person. And he might have thought that after four years these are felony convictions but they're DUIs, that somehow or another they went away.

I don't know that most people would know that a

felony DUI is something that would prohibit you from getting a gun. One can certainly go and petition to try to get the right to bear an arm and to vote and do the many other things that one -- but he didn't do that. I think the evidence is pretty clear on that one, so I'm not going to spend a lot of time on Count 4.

I'm going to focus on the other counts. We need to go through and look at some of this evidence together. And I'm going to start with the -- one of the very first witnesses that the government put on.

And I will tell you, I'm not good with computers.

You saw during the course of this trial whenever it came to electronics, Mary handled all those things, so I don't have a PowerPoint. I just -- I'm not very good. So I'll put a couple of pictures up for you and things, but that's it.

Mr. Mubarak came in here. And although you probably don't have his picture in your book, I don't think anybody is going to forget what he looked like when he walked in here.

It's the fellow dressed in white.

Why did the government bring him in here? I'm not sure, except I think they were hoping that he was going to say that my client was telling everybody that there was a Khalifah and that he believed in the Khalifah.

What did Mubarak say? He said my client came to him and asked him about whether there was a Khalifah or not, the

head of the new Caliphate, the head of ISIS.

And he told him no, hell no. There isn't any more Khalifahs. There's no more Khalifahs since the Prophet.

And he questioned him some more because this was a man that he went to because Mr. Mubarak had been a Muslim for a much longer time. And he eventually called his son and had his son speaking to my client. And he said he was respectful. He didn't argue with him. But his son confirmed there was no Khalifah and that was sort of the end of it.

Now, Mr. Mubarak also went on to tell us that in the summer of 2014, that my client became disenchanted with Mr. Simpson because of things he was doing and also because he thought that he had planted some sort of tracking device or something in his car and was trying to get him to leave and actually got Mubarak to come over with a couple of his friends and they threw him out.

Lastly, what Mr. Mubarak told us, which becomes rather important, is that my client lived with him for a week to two weeks, sometime in either February or March. He thought it was probably March. He wasn't sure. I'm going to let you rely upon your own recollections, because he was having some problems.

Well, why does that become important? Because we're going to have to deal with Ali Soofi. Because, you know, if you believe Ali Soofi and you think he's telling the truth,

1 he's guilty as hell.

Ali Soofi is a liar. And this isn't Perry Mason. I can't get Ali Soofi to say, "Oh, my goodness, I told a lie," and, you know, the station is over for the day.

When you're cross-examining somebody and you think or you believe that they're lying on the stand, you have to do it in a way by looking at what other people say, letting you rely upon your logic, seeing if there are inconsistent statements that they have made prior, or does it just make any sense at all what he's talking about.

And one of the reasons I was -- I asked Mubarak about my client living with him in the spring for several weeks is if my client is staying over at Simpson and Soofi's two and three nights a week, why does he need to stay at Mubaraks?

Why can't he just stay with him them? That makes no sense.

Somebody's -- something is wrong here.

There are four witnesses that the government has relied upon in this case: Stefan Verdugo, the man in orange, the two young men, young boys that lived across the street, Carlos and Juan, and Ali Soofi.

Those are the four that I really have to deal with the most.

Now, Stefan Verdugo. He lived with my client off and on for a number -- for about a year-and-a-half. He was there back in 2014. He becomes very important in this case because

the government relies upon him.

What the government told you he said he said. The question is: Is it truthful or is it a lie? And I contend that the vast majority of what came out of his mouth was a lie.

Now, Stefan said that he had gone shooting with Simpson and Soofi and Abdul Malik on at least two occasions and he said he told the FBI where that was. It was somewhere off of -- I think it was Table Mesa Road up in the northern part of the county.

When the FBI learned where -- about where my client had been shooting with Sergio, they sent a team out there.

They took pictures. They videotaped it. They audiotaped it.

They had pictures and flags and everything else. They picked up shells and brought them in here to show you.

Why couldn't they do the same where Stefan Verdugo told them? Because it didn't happen. They weren't able to find any place where Stefan Verdugo could -- had told them that there had been shooting because it didn't happen.

My client went shooting with Simpson and Soofi one time and that was with Sergio Martinez. That was it. Stefan Verdugo lied.

Stefan Verdugo made a number of comments about what he heard and he tried to say on direct examination, and even on cross-examination, if we could verify that by talking to

```
1
      Daniel. He mentioned "Daniel" a number of times. And if you
      recall, I asked him at the end of the cross -- was that --
 2
 3
      what Daniel was that? Was that Daniel VanHook? And he said
 4
     yes.
 5
               Now, I'm going to show you part of Stefan Verdugo's
 6
      testimony. And I just made a copy of it. I didn't make a
 7
      nice PowerPoint for you.
 8
               And he said something happened in France.
 9
               And he said: Yes.
10
               And do you remember what the attack was about?
11
               It was about people drawing the Prophet Muhammad.
12
               And what happened in Paris, do you know?
13
               They ran into Paris and shot people that drew the
      pictures of Muhammad.
14
15
               And then I went on and asked him a number of
      questions.
16
17
               So what was the reaction of D, Ibrahim and Soofi?
               And he tells us that the news that these people had
18
      conducted this attack in Paris on the magazine.
19
               They were -- they were upset. They were mad that
20
      their Muslim brothers had gotten killed over trying to avenge,
21
22
      I guess, their Prophet.
23
               Now, what became important in that questioning was
24
      what he says here.
25
               Okay. Who else was there with you?
```

```
1
               It was me -- me, D, Daniel, Elton, and Soofi.
 2
      were all -- they were like in the living room area and me and
      Daniel were standing in the -- like the kitchen.
 3
 4
               We put Daniel VanHook on the stand. What did Daniel
 5
      VanHook say?
 6
               Did you ever hear anything about -- within those
 7
      conversations about a contest in Texas of drawing the Prophet
      Muhammad?
 8
 9
               No.
10
               And did you ever hear anything about any mention of
      the attack in Paris, a Charlie Hebdo attack, between Ibrahim
11
12
      and Decarus Thomas?
13
               The answer was: No.
14
               Additionally, Stefan Verdugo told us:
15
               And did you hear ISIS used in your presence?
               Yes.
16
17
               Can you tell us how it came up?
               There was a thing on the news about ISIS. And it was
18
      me, Daniel, and D. We were sitting in the living room. And D
19
      started telling us that he was part of ISIS. And we
20
      thought -- like we thought it was kind of funny at first, you
21
22
      know, and then D started getting really crazy about it.
23
               We asked Daniel VanHook:
24
               And during that time -- and I want to focus on from
25
      November 2014 to when Decarus moved out of the Cochise house.
```

1	That's the time period that Verdugo was living with
2	him.
3	During that time were you ever with Stefan when
4	Decarus told you he was part of ISIS?
5	No.
6	Did Decarus ever tell you he was part of ISIS?
7	No.
8	Additionally, you might recall that Stefan said that
9	he had moved out in March of 2015. And I asked him a number
10	of times about was he sure it wasn't January.
11	No, it was March.
12	We asked Mr. VanHook did he ever make a call to
13	Decarus or rather I keep thinking Decarus from the thing
14	to Abdul Malik about letting Stefan move back in.
15	And he said: Yes.
16	Stefan in the spring of 2015 was having a financial
17	hard time. He had lived with a guy by the name of Nick Love.
18	He had also moved into some Budget Hotel. Didn't seem to have
19	a job and wanted to move back in with Abdul Malik and had
20	asked VanHook to make the call for him.
21	VanHook made the call for him.
22	And Decarus said no. He didn't want to have anything
23	to do with Stefan Verdugo anymore.
24	Stefan lied when he said that he didn't have VanHook
25	make that call.

Stefan Verdugo would have you believe that my client is going to commit an act of terror in Texas that isn't -- that the event is not announced until February 11th. I think the evidence shows that Verdugo moved out in January.

And I go to Amber Pluff, the woman that the government brought in. And I'm not sure why, but I think they were hoping that she was going to confirm that there was a ride in a car that she participated in, but she hadn't really heard any conversation.

But what she did tell us was that she started dating

Stefan Verdugo the first of March. And that it was her

understanding that he had been living the prior several months

with Nick Lowe, which now puts us back into January.

And you know, I felt sorry for the poor woman. I mean, what comes out of her examination is that Stefan Verdugo is about as low a life as one is going to be. He meets this girl in March and by the summer he is kidnapping her, selling her to men, and when that gets found out, he takes off and goes to California.

All during this time he's helping the FBI. He's the confidential informant that they have had. He's the one they're relying on. He's the one that's met with them on May 8th and they have now relied on him, Stefan Verdugo, the man in orange, to start trailing my client 24 hours a day.

Now, you've got to ask yourself. Stefan Verdugo also

said I made telephone calls for the FBI to Abdul Malik. Why would he do that? Well, they're trying to get evidence to show that, you know -- and rightfully so. That's exactly what they're supposed to do.

You didn't hear one telephone call played by the FBI.
Why? Because there's nothing there. I mean, if Stefan
Verdugo had heard my client say: I was going to go to Dallas
or Garland, Texas, and I decided not to, don't you think he
would have gotten on the phone and said to him: Boy, Malik,
am I really glad you didn't go to Garland. I'm glad I helped
talk you out of it or I'm glad you decided to change your mind
or isn't that terrible what happened to those guys or, boy,
I'm glad you're still alive. Something. There would have
been something. There's nothing.

What else did we learn from Stefan Verdugo? That the FBI -- they wired him up. And they had him ask to go back and work for Abdul Malik. And Abdul Malik wasn't going to live with Stefan but he did let him work for him for a while.

You would have thought there would have been something in those conversations that you would have heard that would have supported the governments case, but there isn't. There wasn't. Because Stefan Verdugo was lying. It didn't happen.

The government relies on two young boys that lived across the street --

```
1
                    And Stefan Verdugo, when I asked him on
 2
      cross-examination did you get paid $500?
 3
               Yes.
               Why?
 5
               I don't know. Gas money.
 6
               Well, the FBI later on tells us through Agent Whitson
 7
      that, well, it wasn't just gas money. He had outstanding
 8
      tickets. And we wanted to make sure that they were paid.
 9
               They didn't pay them. They gave him $500.
10
               And they didn't give him any incentives to testify,
11
      for goodness sakes. No. They went and met with him in the
12
      jail down at South Buckeye where he had been sitting since
13
      June and they knew he was down there because the FBI assisted
14
      in bringing him back from San Diego. But the FBI had a
15
      constitutional mandate or obligation to provide a statement to
16
      Mr. Verdugo that might help him in his case that's in Maricopa
17
      County.
               But you know what? That constitutional obligation
18
      somehow or another didn't rise like cream coming to the top
19
20
      until the day after they met with him.
               So they go and meet with him in December, right
21
22
      before this trial is going to start, talk to him about what
23
      he's going to testify to, and tell him that we're not giving
24
      you this as an incentive but we're going to -- we're
25
      constitutionally required to tell the County Attorney what you
```

did and what we saw.

I don't know why that constitutional mandate didn't seem to come to their attention in July or August or September, October, November, but it came to their attention right before he's going to testify. And he came in here on their own, as you were just told. Had nothing. His civic duty to come in here.

Carlos and Juan. Carlos is the younger boy with the long hair and he said he really never heard my client talk about going to do anything just horrible. There was no mention of the attack.

He said that he had heard that my client was going to give Ibrahim an AK47. He said that there may be something about this Muhammad Drawing Contest that was going on in Garland. He had heard about that but he didn't know that my client was going to go attack them or not.

But he heard about the contest. And one of the things one does on cross-examination is you ask them questions and try to figure out when they heard it and who is there.

And he said he heard it somewhere between --

First, he thought it was before Christmas of 2014 and then he said he thought it might even be before Thanksgiving of 2014.

Well, it's not announced until February 11th of 2014.
Well, you might think, well, he just doesn't remember

```
1
      the date --
 2
               THE COURT: Excuse me. Did you mean '15?
 3
               MR. MAYNARD: '15.
                                   Thank you.
               He might just not remember the dates. Most kids
 5
      remember when Christmas happens and they know when the big
 6
      events happen versus the bad events.
 7
               Now, what was more interesting was Juan. Juan was
 8
      the older brother who was 15 years old who got on the stand.
      That is -- and some sort of ROTC or something.
 9
10
               And Juan told us that he heard about the Muhammad
11
      Drawing Contest on three separate occasions. The first one,
12
      his brother Lupe was living there in the house because my
13
      client constantly let people live there with him. They came
14
      and they went.
15
               We heard -- nobody contradicted that he had all kinds
16
      of people coming in. He had homeless people staying there.
17
      He had homeless people that had children staying there. Must
      be a pretty good cook, because everybody talked about eating
18
      his food and coming over to -- he would cook for almost
19
      everybody in the neighborhood.
20
21
               But Juan's conversation was interesting because he
22
      has three separate occasions when he hears about this. The
23
      first one is when his brother Lupe is there.
24
               And I asked him: If we know when Lupe lived there,
25
      then we'll know when that happened.
```

1 And he said: Yes. 2 Well, the only testimony concerning Lupe was from my 3 The government didn't bring Lupe in to ask him. 4 client said he lived there for the month of October of 2014. 5 That's it. It's uncontradicted. 6 They could have brought in Lupe. Could have brought in his mother from across the street. Could have brought in 7 8 any of these people. Didn't do it. But he says he's in there watching -- he's playing a video game. He sneaks down the 9 10 hallway. He hears Simpson and Abdul Malik talking about this Garland, Texas event. 11 12 Well, couldn't happen when he said it did, but let's 13 assume it happened anyway. 14 What's the conversation? The conversation is that 15 the known terrorist Simpson is trying to talk him down. You 16 know, Abdul Malik, don't go. Don't go to Dallas. You know, 17 you might get killed. I mean, that's terrible. Don't do it. 18 And so he goes back to the room. The next time he hears about this is -- he's in the car and he's in the car 19 20 with his brother. And he and his brother both have ear buds 21 in. 22 The brother seems to be listening to music. He does 23 not seem to be listening to music because he's looking down 24 and he knows that exactly this conversation that Abdul Malik 25 was on with Simpson on a bluetooth took exactly ten minutes.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

And he doesn't have any music in so he can hear the whole conversation. And then again, it's about this attack in Garland that Malik is going to go and he's going to shoot people in Dallas. Garland, Texas. He's also thinking about blowing himself up. He's going to strap dynamite to himself and go into a mall because he's so angry with what's going on. That's the second conversation. The third one is we're back to the house again and it's sometime around Christmas but we're not sure. It could be after Christmas. And he sneaks down the hall. But this time there are three people. It's Simpson, AK Waseem, and Abdul Malik. And he hears the three of them and he's seeing them through this mirror that seems to be only -- he sees them but they don't seem to see him. But he hears them talking again. And again, they're talking -- they're trying to talk him down because he is so angry about what's going on in Garland, Texas, that he's going to go there to shoot people. But he's also thinking that he may put dynamite on his chest and go to a mall. And I asked him the question, you know, was he going to go to the mall first or was he going to go to Garland? Oh, he was going to go to the mall. So he was going to go to the mall and blow himself up?

But Simpson told him, gee, if you do that, you can spend your life in prison. But after he blew himself up, that was when he was going to go to Garland, Texas, and commit these heinous acts that he is now sitting here in front of you.

That was his testimony. That's what they want you to believe because they don't care what the truth is. They're looking for a conviction. That's pitiful. Relying on that testimony is just pitiful.

Sergio. Sergio came in here and I think Sergio told the truth. There was -- I mean, scared to death, as anybody would be under these circumstances.

He thinks he's now taken out to shoot in the desert two guys who have now committed an act of terror in another state. And when he was first asked by the FBI, Did you do this? And he said, No. And then they cautioned him that lying to the FBI could be a crime, he said, Yeah, I did. You know, he was scared to death.

But he said exactly what happened. That sometime in January my client drove out there with Simpson and Soofi. He had called him for several weeks saying, you know, can I come out there and shoot guns? In fact, the government would have you believe that he wanted to go out there and find the place that was in the desert that was remote and quiet.

That's not what Sergio said. Sergio said he called

and asked can we go to your mothers house and shoot? And Sergio said, no, I don't want to shoot rifles here because it's too noisy.

So they went to Sergios. Played basketball. Jumped on the trampoline. And eventually, Sergio was -- and what happens? Soofi takes the guns out of the car and brings them in. And they have a show-and-tell with Sergio. And Sergio thinks -- he thinks all the guns belong to Soofi.

And he is showing them the new gun that he's gotten for Christmas. They're showing him what they have. And then they go off and they drive five or ten minutes down the road to an area that -- that Sergio knows and that's where they shoot. And they shoot for some period of time. And it's in the evening and it's dark and you can see the flash from the guns at the end of it and the kids are wearing headlamps.

Now, Sergio then takes the government out there and shows them exactly where he took them to shoot. They find all kinds of ammunition and he cooperates as fully as he possibly can.

The government spent a lot of time going through all of this stuff and going through all of these computers and all of this electronic material. And there's absolutely no question that when you look at the electronic equipment that was at Soofis and Simpson's, it is loaded with what one would believe are radical materials.

They kept -- they keep wanting to go back to saying that my client had radical stuff on his stuff. Clearly, the Lenovo that was taken in 2012 has that type of material on it. But back then, he said from the very beginning, and Agent Nash even confirmed it, he always said that thumb drive, I don't know what's on it and it's not mine. I didn't have anything to do with it.

And in 2014 when they call him and tell him you need to come pick this up, he initially says I don't want the Lenovo back. You guys have probably put something in it and I don't want it.

And they're -- you know, you've got to come get it back. You can sell it. You can do what you want with I. And Agent Nash told us just two days ago that that conversation only took about five or eight minutes.

Now, the government, you know, wants you to think what was my client supposed to be telling them at that time. He comes and he picks up the computer. Agent Nash says I didn't interrogate him. I didn't ask him questions. I just -- I'm in the parking lot and he's telling me things.

Well, what's he telling you? Jeez. At this point

I'm not having much to do with Simpson because I threw him out

of the house after the summer of 2013. That's -- you know,

the thumb drive, he takes it and he signs the receipt. But

what does he do with it? He destroys it because he doesn't

want it anymore.

What does he do with the Lenovo? He really doesn't want it anymore but he owes money to Sergio. So he tells Sergio, look -- you know, Sergio says, well, you can pay me back in part by giving me the Lenovo. So they try to clean the Lenovo. If there's anything on it and they don't know what's on it, they don't want these children to see anything.

And he gives it to him. And the understanding is both my client and both Sergio tried to clean the Lenovo computer. Apparently, didn't do a good job. There's a lot of stuff that's still on it, but he certainly didn't give it to Sergio to use with his children thinking that it was loaded with stuff that they shouldn't see.

The government brought in the individual who sold my client the .38 and my client doesn't deny he went out there and he bought that .38 at night. He had gotten it off Backpage. Called him up and paid \$350.

Why is it important there's \$350? It really goes to the credibility of the individual who was selling the gun. I mean, what he told you was that, "This was only the second gun I had ever sold."

He had just -- and I pointed out, he had just bought that gun about 30 days prior to this sale going on. Well, this is a guy who's bought a gun. He's selling it for more than he paid for it and he's selling it out of the trunk of

1 his car at night. 2 And this is his second time? No. I mean, he sat 3 there and -- look, when I do these deals, you know, nobody 4 brings big wads of cash because they're going to get robbed. 5 I always park under a light so that everybody can see me. 6 this is his second time, how does he already have a process 7 that he goes through? 8 He doesn't want to have the government coming after him, so he's sort of backing up and trying to walk away from 9 10 this thing. 11 And my client says, yeah, that's the guy. I gave him 12 a card. He told me that he was looking for a job because he 13 was sort of down on his luck. I told him that my jobs are 14 seasonal. Give me a call. And maybe I will have something 15 for you later on. 16 Now, he says that my client said he was in the market 17 for a bunch of guns. My client says no. He offered to sell me a .22 and I didn't want a .22. 18 My client certainly didn't go out and buy any more 19 quns after that. There's no evidence that he bought any more 20 In fact, you now have to ask yourself -- the government 21 quns. 22 keeps saying that my client provided either the money, the 23 guns, or the ammunition. Who brought in Robert Abke? Robert Abke was a fellow 24

that we brought in who sold 800 rounds of ammunition to

25

1 Simpson and Soofi in the course of a week in January of 2015 2 for those assault rifles and they knew it. He had been interviewed by them. 3 They knew who sold that ammunition and they chose not 5 to bring him in here. Why? I mean when Abke testified, Do 6 you know him? Have you ever seen my client? What was the 7 answer? No. 8 Put a picture of Simpson. Yeah, that looks like him. 9 10 Soofi. 11 I'm not sure, but that looks like him. 12 They had the text messages from Bunker Bob but chose 13 not to tell you about them because they don't want to know the 14 They want a conviction. truth. 15 When we started putting on evidence in this case, I 16 started off in what I hoped would be a chain of events that 17 had occurred on May 3rd. I brought in Dunston Simpson, Jr. who was his brother that was killed. Why? Because he's the 18 one that starts the dominoes falling that tells how my client 19 20 learned of Elton Simpsons demise. Dunston got a call from a reporter. Dunston 21 22 doesn't -- tries to get in touch with his brother. Isn't able 23 to get in touch with him. The reporter apparently has told 24 him that it looks like your brother may have been involved in 25 an event in Garland, Texas.

Dunston doesn't even know where his brother lives.

Now, he told us that his brother had gotten closer to the family in the last three or four months, but he doesn't know where he lives so he doesn't know where to go.

So he starts calling people that he thinks know his brother and he gets Stuart Sampson who we brought in. And Stuart Sampson says I told Dunston while I'm on the phone with him I'll ride down to your brothers place and see if he's there.

And so he drove over to the apartment which was not too far from the mosque. He goes up. Nobody comes to the door. But he looks -- looks like there are people or vehicles outside. He gets back in his vehicle. Drives back to the mosque. And by the time he gets there, he's grabbed, handcuffed, and put on the ground and it's the FBI doing an investigation on this.

Once they finally let him go, he calls his brother and he calls my client. Where are they? I mean, my client is sitting there -- a co-conspirator, knowing that these guys have gone to Garland, Texas, to commit this heinous act, you would expect he would be sitting there on pins and needles waiting to see if they succeeded or not succeeded.

He's chowing down at Red Lobster with his nephew who has just come into town on May 1st. And I put his nephew Anthony Sampson on the stand to tell you what his reaction

was. The reaction was it was shock and amazement. He couldn't finish his meal. They had to put it in a to-go box and he leaves.

And he goes by to see what's going on over at Soofi's and Simpsons and it's covered with police officers.

So now he goes to AKs. And AK is mad at him and is not answering his phone calls, so we have seen all these text messages where he's saying, "Pick up the phone. I've got to talk to you."

So he goes there and he sees him. And they go back and go to Soofis and Simpsons place and they can't get in there because there's so many police officers.

So what do they do? They go to Dunston Simpson, Sr.s house. If he's committed this conspiracy and knows that these people have died, is he going to go see the fellow that's died's father?

And when they go in and they see his dad, they look at the news and they're trying to determine what's actually happened and they can't figure it out. Although he seems to recognize the car and says that, geez, it looks like Nadir Soofis car but they're still not sure.

What also was important when I put Dunston Simpson,

Sr. on the stand was I asked him whether he had received his

sons car registration. All right. And we'll get to that in a

minute, but you'll recall that I asked the government -- now,

I put in -- we put into evidence, not the government -- the document that the FBI had found in Soofi and Simpsons apartment. They had sent it back to Quantico, Virginia. They had it electrostatically tested.

Agent Whitson then prepares a 302 report concerning the document. And what does the document show? Well, the original document which is Exhibit 553 doesn't show us too much. But what they were able to find, which is Exhibit 554, is this. And again, I don't speak Arabic but then:

Dear brother in Allah. Glory be to God. There was a change in plans indeed. Something dreadful came up. The money that I had from you was being used for what was needed for the initial plan but that changed. This money is what your left over --

I don't know what the next word is.

I will leave you with the title of my car to do as you please with it. I believe Abdul Malik knows how to get it notarized. I was also going to give you my tax return but it won't be here in time. Please forgive me if you do not get all the money back.

Always fear Allah and keep me -- on and on.

Why is that important? Does it give you some idea of who gave him the money? Whoever he is giving the title to his car is the person who he's either sounds like he's returning the money -- some money. He's giving him the title to his

1 car. Would have liked to have given him the tax return. 2 What did the FBI do to investigate this? I asked 3 Agent Whitson on the stand: Do you know who got the title to 4 Do you know who -- who was the recipient of this 5 note? 6 I'm not sure. Maybe, but I'm not sure. 7 Well, the chain went like this. When I put AK on the 8 stand, I asked him when is the last time you've seen Soofi and 9 Simpson? 10 And again, the government didn't put AK on the stand. We did. It's not my witness. He's the witness that you need 11 12 to try to get to the truth of what happened. 13 He gets on the stand and says that at 8:30 or 9:00 14 o'clock on May 1st, Simpson and Soofi stop by my house. They 15 bring me a bowl of soup. 16 Well, that confirms what Ali said, yeah, they were 17 cooking soup that night. But what else does he get? He gets 18 the key from Simpson and he gets an envelope from Simpson that 19 he doesn't know what's in it. And he doesn't really even 20 realize at the time that the car key is to the car. 21 And Simpson says to him: Give this envelope to 22 Saabir Nurse. Who is Saabir Nurse? He's a man that Simpson 23 has worked with. 24 Implication would be Saabir Nurse is the one who gave 25 him the money.

1 Then what happens? 2 AK says: I give the envelope to Saabir Nurse. give him the key to the car. 3 4 Then what happens? 5 Dunston Simpson says after my son died, Saabir Nurse 6 gave me the title to my sons car and the key. 7 Did the government put in any of that evidence? No. Because they don't want to know what the truth is. 8 a conviction. 9 10 The government put on Ali Soofi because they wanted 11 you to believe him. And if you do, my client is going to 12 prison for a long, long time. 13 Ali Soofi lied. Ali Soofi, I contend -- and I can't 14 get into his head. I'm not exactly sure why he did what he did. 15 16 There's a number of things that could have motivated 17 him to do what he did. I think what it was was he was scared to death that he had lived in that apartment with those guys 18 for 13 or 14 months. He knew everything that had gone on in 19 there. And he was afraid the FBI was going to be looking at 20 him and he has to make it go away. Make it put on the back of 21 22 somebody else. It's almost like, you know, it can't be Mr. Ewell. 23 24 It's got to be Tom Robinson who did it. It's not him. 25 not the left-handed guy. It's Tom Robinson. He's the bad

1 guy. 2 Again, when you're cross-examining and trying to show 3 somebody is lying, it's not Perry Mason. They're not going to 4 fall apart on the stand. That just doesn't happen. But what 5 is important is for you to watch how they look, what their 6 demeanor is, how they act, where they're looking. I mean, 7 those are things that are all important and the Court has 8 advised you of that in a jury instruction. 9 I spent a fair amount of time at the very beginning 10 of the cross-examination going through a time line because 11 those are important. Trying to get the time down. Have him 12 tell me what the time was. I asked him about when his brother 13 had bought the gun. And this is the transcript of this trial. 14 This is page 41 and I said: 15 And when did your brother buy his? 16 His was bought -- that was closer to the, you know, 17 the beginning of the year. I mean, because he had had it for two months, so it was about February/March time that he had 18 had this weapon. 19 20 February or March? 21 Yes. 22 Now, we know that that's not right. We know that he 23 probably bought it in January because he's out there with 24 Sergio shooting in January, so he has to have it by then.

All right. Then I ask him a number of questions

25

```
1
      which, you know when he hit the stand and he testified and he
      sat there and cried for five or ten minutes at the very
 2
      beginning.
 3
 4
               I mean, everybody felt sorry for him. You couldn't
 5
      help but feel sorry for him. He lost his brother.
 6
      the sense from this jury that, boy, they're looking at me,
 7
      they're looking at my client, and they're thinking, wow, this
 8
      is terrible.
 9
               But he lied. He goes on and says:
10
               And you said he started coming and he --
11
               The "he" is my client.
12
               -- three to four nights a week and that he slept over
13
      there three nights a week.
14
               When did he start sleeping over there three nights a
15
      week?
16
               I mean it was -- I mean close around -- I'd say like
17
      December time. I remember it was closer towards the end of
      the year it was more frequent.
18
               You never heard anybody who lived in that Cochise
19
      house say that he was over sleeping at somebody else's house
20
      three nights a week. Why? Because it didn't happen. I mean,
21
22
      Carlos and Juan and Verdugo, everybody. Nobody says he's
23
      gone. He's there.
24
               Why in the world would a man who has a three-bedroom
25
     house or a four-bedroom house go to an apartment -- a
```

1 one-bedroom apartment where there are three men and a boy 2 living on the weekends? 3 I mean, the testimony was is that Simpson is sleeping 4 on one end of a couch, Soofi is sleeping -- Ali Soofi is 5 sleeping on the other end of the couch, and Nadir is sleeping 6 in the bedroom. So he would give it up and go stay with them 7 and either sleep on the floor or one of them would sleep on 8 the floor. 9 You have to use your common sense. It doesn't make 10 any sense. 11 Also, if he's having the flood at the house and he's 12 taking a shower, why doesn't he just go stay over there? Why 13 would he go take a shower? Why would he go to anybody's 14 house? He could just stay with them all the time because 15 that's where -- at least according to Ali Soofi that's where 16 he is staying. Why would he ever go stay with Mubarak for a 17 week or two? Why not just with them? And there are small things that you ask somebody that 18 you hope to be able to use later in a closing. For instance, 19 20 in this case it says: And is it your best recollection that they went 21 22 shooting in the morning? 23 Yes. And then you saw them either in the afternoon or was 24 25 it in the evening?

1 It was later that evening. 2 Nobody ever testified they went shooting in the 3 morning except him on this one occasion. And why does this 4 become important? Because this is the time he says he sees 5 them cleaning the gun is that they've gone shooting in the 6 morning. They've come back at night. And my client is 7 teaching them how to clean these guns for some reason. 8 Now, the government would have you believe that, geez, when he saw that Simpsons gun jammed back two years 9 10 earlier at Sergios house, this made him know that he had an 11 epiphany. Sergio -- or Simpson doesn't know how to take care 12 of guns. I need to teach him how to do it. 13 Now, what the point was nobody could unjam the gun. 14 I mean, they didn't know how to do it. Simpson didn't know 15 how to do it. He didn't know how to do it. Sergio didn't 16 know how to do it. They didn't know anything about guns. 17 He goes on and says he only went shooting -- I said: Did you ever go shooting with your brother? 18 Not in Arizona. 19 Well, I'm going to tell you, he contradicts himself 20 later on and says, well, I went one time up near Sedona but it 21 22 was -- we were only with pistols. 23 Oh, but then, oh, yeah, then I went in Salt Lake City 24 which he says here. But then he says: 25 Oh, later on, yeah I did go with my dad and my

1 brother in Kansas. 2 The story keeps changing. 3 He was also one who seemed to be very fit. And I 4 asked him questions about running because he wanted you to 5 believe that he would go out running two, three days a week, 6 20 to 30 miles at time. 7 You might do that if you're an ultramarathon runner. 8 And I asked him that and he said, no, I'm a marathoner. marathons. Marathoners don't run 30 miles a week or 30 miles 9 10 at a time two or three times a week. It doesn't happen. 11 What ultimately happens in this matter is I then 12 start asking him about his first meeting with the FBI. Now, 13 he told us on direct examination that when he first heard 14 about the event in Garland, Texas, and he saw this, at first he thought it wasn't his brother. He thought it was Simpson 15 16 and Abdul Malik. 17 That's what he told us. He saw it at about five or six o'clock in the morning on May 4th. He meets with the FBI 18 at eleven o'clock. I played over and over -- or read over and 19 over again portions of the transcript. They asked him: 20 Is there anybody else that you were aware of that was 21 22 in that apartment that you think might have been involved in 23 something like this?

it wasn't his brother, he thought it was Abdul Malik, what

The guy who just told us that that morning he thought

24

25

```
1
      does he say to the FBI?
 2
               No. Well, maybe AK.
 3
               Anybody else?
               No.
 5
               And this is at a time when he's telling us that for
 6
      the prior four, five, six months he has been spending three or
 7
      four days a week over there at that place and he's sleeping
      over there two or three nights a week.
 8
 9
               He's lying.
10
               At page 84 of the transcript he says:
11
               Let me direct your attention to page 16 of the
12
      transcript of your testimony with the FBI or your statement to
13
      the FBI that day. Take a look at page 16. Start on line 2
14
      and read down. Do you see beginning on line 10 where you
      said:
15
               I mean, that's the only person other than that they
16
17
      would leave. They would always leave and do stuff and they
      wouldn't tell me.
18
19
               Do you see that?
20
               Yes.
               Do you remember telling the FBI that on that morning?
21
22
               No, I don't. I really can't remember a lot of what I
23
      said.
24
               And earlier:
25
               Mr. Soofi, I have placed on the screen a portion of a
```

```
1
      certified transcript of the conversation that you had with the
 2
      detectives on May 4th. Have you seen this document?
 3
               No.
               Going down:
 5
               Okay. I'm going to ask you to look at page 15,
 6
      starting on line 12. Do you see the question from the
      detective?
 7
 8
               Yes.
 9
               Would you read that to yourself?
10
               Do you recall now that you told them that the only
11
      guy that you recall coming to the house at the time was a
12
      fellow by the name of AK.
13
               I mean, I can't completely recall --
14
               His answer was:
15
               I can't completely recall my conversation at that
16
             But, I mean, when I initially had come to the FBI, I
17
      mean, my mind was incomplete --
               And I said:
18
19
               I'm sure you were upset. Your brother had just been
      killed.
20
21
               But I go on to ask him:
22
               And the FBI are coming in there to investigate
23
      because they're wanting to know, as they told you, if there
24
      was anybody else that may be out there that would be involved
25
      in something like this, correct?
```

1	Yes.
2	And you've just told us that for the prior three or
3	four weeks or three or four months that Abdul Malik was
4	sleeping at your brothers house two or three nights a week and
5	staying there three or four?
6	Yes.
7	But when they asked you if there was anybody else
8	that could be involved, you don't mention Abdul Malik at all,
9	do you?
L O	It was based off of
L1	Excuse me. You did not mention Abdul Malik the first
L2	time you were interviewed by the FBI?
L3	No, I didn't.
L4	He's just told us on direct that he thinks it's Malik
L5	that's there with Simpson. He's lying.
L6	What happens over the course of this is that the lies
L7	get bigger and bigger.
L8	He goes home to Kansas. Never comes back to Phoenix.
L9	They wire him up. He makes telephone calls. He makes a phone
20	call to my client, clearly trying to get evidence that they're
21	going to use to try to convict him.
22	You didn't hear the phone call. Why? Because
23	there's nothing bad on it. He didn't do anything. He then
24	Ali then makes a number of phone calls to AK asking him a
25	number of things. And, yeah, AK tells him don't talk to the

1 I don't blame him. I wouldn't either. 2 And what happens? They're taping all of these conversations. Except when they go to interview him in 3 4 January 29th, they fly out to Texas to go to his mothers 5 house, not to prepare him to come in here to testify, but 6 rather, just to see what he's going to say. 7 Now, he told us that he met with the FBI here the day 8 after his brother is killed. Meets with them on the 5th at the airport. He had, he said, at least three conversations 9 10 and one was video-linked while he was in Kansas. He's made 11 all these phone calls for them. 12 But then they fly out there and do they tape the 13 interview with him? No. Why not? 14 Because if you tape the interview, they have to turn 15 it over to the defense so the defense can see what he's going 16 to say. 17 By not taping it, they don't have to tell us. We get their 302. We get their version of what he's going to say. 18 And for the very first time after having met with the FBI over 19 six times, he now decides on January 29th, oh, yeah, by the 20 way, I saw them -- I saw Abdul Malik teaching them how to 21 22 clean the guns. 23 That's the first time. And how do we know that's the first time? Whitson tells us. 24 25 I asked him on cross-examination. I went through the

```
1
      different meetings that happened in Kansas and I asked him:
 2
               Wasn't it -- was that the first time?
 3
               And he says yes.
               Looking at Agent Whitsons testimony in this case,
      page 124 from March 3rd. I asked him:
 5
 6
               Okay. He --
 7
               And I'm referring to Ali Soofi.
               He never mentioned in that interview that he had seen
 8
      Abdul Kareem assisting or directing his brother and
 9
10
      Mr. Simpson in cleaning the weapons, did he?
               I would have to review my report to --
11
12
               You had a notebook. Do you want to look at
13
      September 29th?
14
               I have just reviewed my report from September 25th
      and I don't see that he was asked that question or that he
15
16
      provided any information related to cleaning or disassembling
17
      or reassembling a weapon.
18
               I then went on and I asked Agent Whitson:
               And you did not audio or videotape that interview?
19
               And we're talking about him now being in Texas in
20
      January.
21
2.2
               No, I did not.
23
               That was the first time that he ever mentioned that
24
      he had seen my client directing Mr. Soofi, his brother, and
25
      Mr. Simpson in how to clean and disassemble any of these
```

```
1
      weapons, correct?
 2
               I think that's correct.
 3
               Okay. And that interview took place on January 29th
 4
      of 2015.
 5
               And his response was:
 6
               I'm not sure if I have a copy of the report.
 7
               That's when that interview took place. That's the
      first time that he ever mentioned it.
 8
 9
               He comes up with more and more statements trying to
10
      put the blame on my client as time goes by. Every time the
      FBI meets with him, he thinks of something new. I don't know
11
12
      why, but it seems strange to me.
13
               He told us on direct examination that my client was
14
      the one who purchased the guns that he told the story that his
15
      brother had gone out and bought the gun. He came in.
16
      client was with him. He was complaining how much money had
17
      been spent. And my client said he had bought the guns.
               When I asked him on cross-examination about his
18
      conversations with the FBI he said:
19
               And then you go on -- I'm reading from the transcript
20
      of that May 4th meeting that he had with the FBI.
21
2.2
               They asked him:
23
               Are there any other weapons?
24
               And you say: No, just the handgun. And he had
25
      recently got the AK, probably five -- like five months ago.
```

```
1
      It was like five months ago.
 2
               They asked him the question:
 3
               Do you know how he acquired it?
 4
               Mr. Soofi: Through Craigslist. He bought it on
 5
      Craigslist. Bought it through a private owner. It was
 6
      upgraded, you know. Those guys that have their upgraded
 7
      collection of weapons and they personally do stuff to them.
 8
               Do you know about how much he paid?
               It's like I think 700 bucks.
 9
10
               And I asked the question:
11
               You didn't mention anything about Abdul Malik when
12
      the agents are asking you when your brother purchased the AK,
13
      did you?
14
               Initially, in that first interview, no.
15
               And you didn't tell them that he had gotten the money
16
      from Abdul Malik either, did you?
17
               No. With the questions that were asked, I -- and at
      the time, like I said, it was -- I mean --
18
               What he goes on to say -- and I could go through this
19
      over again and I'm going to stop at this point -- but what he
20
      goes on to say is they ask him:
21
22
               Was there somebody that you think provided him the
23
     money?
24
               And he says: Yeah, it's an Imam.
25
               Who do I think provided him the money? Somebody by
```

```
1
      the name of Saabir Nurse. It seems pretty clear to me.
 2
               But we're not getting to that answer because the FBI
      didn't follow up on it because they're not sure.
 3
 4
               Who got that registration to the car?
 5
               I asked a lot of questions of Agent Whitson in this
      case because of my concern about the rush to judgment by the
 6
 7
      government.
               I asked them:
 8
               We've got a guy who says that my client is spending
 9
10
      three to four days a week over there, spending two to three
11
      nights.
12
               Did you canvass or anybody at the FBI go over there
      and canvass the apartment complex to see if they -- anybody
13
14
      saw him?
15
               And his answer was: We did. Nobody recognized a
     photograph of him.
16
17
               You would think that if he was over there as Ali
      Soofi said, somebody would have seen him that lived there, one
18
      of the neighbors would have.
19
20
               THE COURT: Are you at a --
               MR. MAYNARD: I'm at a place to break.
21
22
               THE COURT: -- at a convenient breaking point?
23
               MR. MAYNARD: I am.
24
               THE COURT: Thank you, Mr. Maynard.
25
               Ladies and gentlemen, we'll go ahead and take our
```

```
1
      afternoon break. We will reconvene in 15 minutes.
 2
               You are reminded not to discuss the case among
      yourselves or with anyone else.
 3
               Please do not form any conclusions about the case
 5
      until you have heard the balance of the closing arguments and
 6
      begun your deliberations.
 7
               Court is in recess for 15 minutes.
          (Recess taken at 1:46 p.m.; resumed at 2:00 p.m.)
 8
                           Thank you, ladies and gentlemen. Please
 9
               THE COURT:
10
      sit down. The record will show the presence of the jury,
      counsel, and the defendant.
11
12
               Mr. Maynard, you may continue.
13
               MR. MAYNARD: Thank you, Your Honor.
14
               I'm getting close to being done. There's a couple of
15
      more areas I just need to touch on briefly.
               I want to show you Exhibits 55, 56, and 57.
16
17
      were letters that were found in Soofi's and Simpson's
      apartment. Again, these were put in by the defense.
18
      weren't put in by the government, although the government is
19
20
      the one that found them.
               These were letters written from an individual by the
21
22
      name of Abu Jihad who is a convicted terrorist who is in
23
     prison down in Florida and he clearly wrote this to Simpson.
24
               And for some reason, Simpson happened to have copies
25
      of letters from Abu Jihad to Saabir Nurse. He has two of
```

them. The same Saabir Nurse. And we have his address that apparently got the registration to the car. That, apparently, is the one who loaned the money to Simpson or gave him the money for whatever he was going to do. And we've heard some testimony about were they going to go to a Marine base?

I don't know where a Marine base is. I don't know if Saabir Nurse gave them money to buy the weapons or to go somewhere else, but it would appear that they decided to use that money to go to Texas and carry out this attack.

There were times in this case when I thought I was in a fraud case. That somehow or another, this was a -- the government was bringing an action against my client accusing him of some sort of insurance fraud.

I guess the theory of the government was that somehow or another he faked getting hit by a car on April 6th and that he was then going to file this fraudulent insurance claim to get money to promote the terrorism.

Well, the terrorist attack is on May 3rd. I mean, I don't think anybody thinks you can get money from an insurance company in three weeks -- or at least I haven't had that kind of experience -- but we spent more time on these medical records and bringing in the woman who ran into my client. She stopped the car. She gave him her card. She contends now that she didn't think she hit him.

We were -- I asked Agent Whitson had they gotten the

medical records from John C. Lincoln who he told them they had gone to and he said no.

So we put in the medical records which were Exhibit 523. And, yes, he went to John C. Lincoln the day after the incident occurred. It says clearly that the patient denies falling to the ground. He states that he didn't feel any pain yesterday but felt it when he woke up this morning. The patient has not tried anything to relieve the pain. He states that he went to sleep and noticed I wasn't walking the same as I was yesterday when he woke up.

He's feeling pain. Pain is subjective. He goes in. He asks for an x-ray. He hasn't broken anything. They keep him in the hospital. And John C. Lincoln, on page 60 under the Clinical Impression is he's got a strained left hip, a lumbar strain and a low-back strain. That's what the hospital said.

Now, he goes to a chiropractor. But additionally, Exhibit 524, he also goes to another doctor later on. And there's the assessment. I mean, maybe these doctors are in cahoots with him. I don't know. Maybe this is Saabir Nurse. But these are the medical records. He got injured. He had pain. This isn't a case about insurance fraud, although the government seems to want to focus on that. The medical records are there.

He then went on to see a chiropractor. He spent I

don't know how many visits, but it's like 10 or 12 visits to the chiropractor. And when they release him, he says: I state with confidence that Abdul Malik Abdul Kareem was truly hurt as he claims he was and I did not find anything that would lead me to believe otherwise. I found this patient's accounting of his injury and clinical presentation to be plausible and believable.

Additionally, you heard Malik testify that on the first of May, after he had gone to Jumu'ah and after he had seen Simpson and Soofi, that he went to a doctor's appointment. This is the doctors appointment he went to. He went to the chiropractor that day. I mean, the documents support what his story has been.

Agent Whitson on cross-examination -- or on direct examination said that he had found they had done forensic accounting on the bank records of my client.

We didn't hear from a forensic accountant because there really wasn't anything to talk about. My client deposited \$10,000 on a particular day in November. He took out 5,000 a couple days later. And Agent Whitson, for some reason, found that activity to be suspicious. But when I asked him whether or not he had checked to see if my client had purchased a vehicle in that time period, he had not.

And I then asked him:

Did you look to see whether or not he had bought one

1 of his two moving trucks within a week of when he made that 2 withdrawal? 3 Yea. We did not find -- see evidence of that. 4 And did you look to see -- even in the documents that 5 you found in his truck, you didn't see any evidence of that? 6 Not -- yeah -- no evidence that I can recall. 7 Well, what we got through discovery from the FBI 8 was -- and that "22" marker is an FBI marker -- is a receipt for the purchase of a truck on November 13, 2014, consistent 9 10 with the date that he took the money out of the bank as he testified to. 11 12 Again, the government isn't interested in the truth. 13 They're interested in a conviction. This is their document. 14 I mean, I don't know how he can't find it. 15 I spent a fair amount of time going through the 16 taping in this case because, look, it's -- it is incredible to 17 me that they have all of these interviews and then just before somebody is going to take the stand and they're going to 18 testify, they don't tape those so that we know exactly what 19 20 they're going to say. And as we talked about a few minutes ago in the case 21 22 of Ali Soofi, I asked him whether they taped Ali Soofis when 23 they flew out to Dallas to meet with his mother and meet with 24 him before he came here and he told me no. 25 And I said was that your decision to make the

```
1
      particular call not to tape him?
 2
               No.
               Who made the decision?
 3
               That would be the decision of the prosecutor.
 5
               Why? Because they don't want to turn over what he
 6
             They want a conviction. They don't want the truth.
 7
               A count in this case centers around whether or not my
      client lied to the FBI on May 5th. And there's no question he
 8
      has always -- if you find evidence that he knew that there was
 9
10
      a Muhammad Drawing Contest prior to May 3rd, then he lied,
11
      because he has always said I never heard of it before.
12
               In fact, everybody except for four witnesses and I
13
      believe Mr. Kohlmann might make five, said they never heard of
14
      it before.
                 I don't remember what Mr. Vidino said yesterday.
      I think he said there was some advertisement that came out on
15
16
      it but he didn't testify that he had seen that before then.
17
      It could have been research that he did later.
               My client said he didn't know they were going to
18
              Nobody except Nathaniel Soofi has ever said that they
19
      knew they were going to Texas.
20
               One of the counts that the government has -- or the
21
22
      statements is that the guns that -- let me not misstate it.
23
      Let me see if I can --
24
               No. 4 was knowing about the contest.
25
               No. 3 is did not know in advance that Simpson and
```

1	Soofi planned to conduct an attack in Garland.
2	No. 2 was that before May 3rd, neither Soofi or
3	Simpson fired the weapons they used in connection with the
4	attack in Garland, Texas.
5	How would he know whether they had fired? He knew
6	they had fired weapons, but the question is, did he know those
7	were the weapons that were used in the attack?
8	I specifically asked the agents: Had you sent the
9	weapons back? Did you have pictures of the weapons?
10	And Nash said no.
11	I mean, even if he knew that they had weapons, what
12	they used in that attack, I don't know how he could ever know.
13	So the question really boils down to the defendant
14	did not go shooting in the desert with Simpson and Soofi
15	before May 3rd of 2015.
16	He certainly did. There's no question about it.
17	And in the June 10th he says I went shooting with
18	them.
19	If we had a video or audio tape, we would know the
20	question that was asked. This question has always seemed
21	strange to me, because why is it that they went shooting in
22	the desert? Why wasn't it: Did you ever go shooting? Did
23	you ever see them shoot guns? Did you ever do any of those
24	things?
25	He contends he doesn't remember that question being

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

He contends that he told the truth. And he certainly told the truth on June 10th. And when you listen to it and you listen to that audio, you don't hear Whitson or Nash saying to him, geez, that's not what you told us before. Nobody seemed surprised by the comment when he says, yes, I went shooting in the desert. Now, you know, clearly, as time goes on, we've had some more testimony about were they running, were they not. That's not the statement that he's being accused of lying to the FBI about. It's not whether they were running or not running. It was whether or not they asked him the question: Did you go shooting in the desert with Simpson and Soofi? And did he say no? And he says: I don't recall. We don't have that videotape. We don't have that audio tape. We don't even have the security tape that it looked like this individual, Mr. Taylor, was telling Agent Whitson he needed to get. Because he says that after they determined they don't have the audio tape or the videotape, there is still a security tape and we can look at that. Yes, we can't hear, but you can look to see the manner that he is answering. You can see his gestures. I spoke with Jeff -- or Mendez this morning and told him that you would require video export from the security

system DVR. He said no problem but requested that you send an

1 e-mail to Sherry McAllister. And Whitson says he's going to 2 do it. I'll touch base with the case agents first. And if 3 4 they want me to proceed, I'm send an e-mail and get with Rich. 5 Why wouldn't you get it? He's just told you you're 6 going to need to get it. Why wouldn't you get it? 7 Additionally, another area that the FBI failed to 8 adequately investigate is the AK47s. I asked him questions about whether or not they had done searches with ATF and what 9 10 they had done in that regards. 11 What we knew from the limited discovery that we had 12 gotten was that there were several individuals in the Phoenix 13 area that in the January time frame were selling AK47s on 14 Craigslist for \$700. Well, do you think for a second that 15 those people are going to say, oh, yeah, that's the one I sold 16 to the terrorist who shot up people in Texas? 17 What they did was, I asked the question: Did the FBI investigate Mr. Biaz to get the text 18 messages to see if he had texted anybody about this? 19 We already had copies of the text messages 20 from one of the phones seized in Dallas. 21 22 They knew that Simpson and Soofi had been texting 23 with this fellow. And Biaz had an AK47 for sale on January 24 6th of 2015 here in Phoenix for \$700. But their contention is 25 it's my client who bought the gun.

1 I then went on to ask: 2 And that's how you came to go to him, correct? 3 Yes. This was a case where the government had the bad quy 5 and then they went out to try to find the facts and make him 6 into a really bad guy. I mean, they thought from the time that Stefan Verdugo came and talked to them that he was a bad 7 8 quy. He was one of these co-conspirators. 9 And so the rest of their time, all they did was spend 10 it trying to sculpt the evidence to convict him, not to find 11 out what really had happened, not to figure out was it Biaz or 12 was it someone else that had sold the qun. Not to figure out 13 who had actually sold the ammunition. Not to figure out who 14 had provided the money. 15 I asked Agent Whitson at one point was he excited, 16 happy when they had gotten authorization from the Department 17 of Justice to file new charges in the Second Superseding Indictment against my client for terrorism, which is the Count 18 5 count, providing material support to a foreign terrorist 19 20 organization. And his response was no. 21 22 Well, so I said: 23 Were you happy when it was -- when it was the 24 government brought that second superseding indictment? 25 No.

1 Didn't you think this was a fantastic thing for the 2 government to do? 3 To do what? 4 Charge him with Conspiracy to Provide Material 5 Support to a Foreign Terrorist Organization? 6 I didn't think that was a happy thing to do. 7 However, on December 14th the government had gotten 8 an e-mail -- Agent Whitson had gotten an e-mail from the U.S. Department of Justice saying you have approval for Conspiracy 9 10 to Provide Material Support as outlined in your e-mail. 11 What's Whitsons response? 12 Fantastic news. Thank you, all three, for all the 13 hard work. I know that there is going to be a lot of people 14 in our organization -- the FBI -- who will be very pleased. 15 Now, look, somebody asked the question: Why did I 16 put that on there? Why did I ask that question? 17 The reason is is that the government became invested in getting a conviction early on once they arrested him. They 18 didn't go out and gather the evidence and present it to you so 19 20 that you could determine what the truth was in this case. 21 This, to me, demonstrated that the government was 22 trying to get the most stringent, toughest charges they could 23 get. And to call somebody a terrorist, to call somebody now 24 in this environment, in this climate, whose name happens to be 25 Abdul Malik Abdul Kareem, that he is providing material

1 support to a foreign terrorist organization is awful. 2 If he did it, okay. But fantastic? Now, did Agent Whitson lie? I don't know. I don't 3 4 know what he remembers. I don't know that he remembered 5 seeing it. But he certainly should have remembered that he 6 was excited about it. Why? Because these are career-making 7 cases. He can tell you he's got 12 other cases that he's 8 handling. He doesn't have one like this. 9 When you went downstairs and you were picked Okav. 10 for this jury and you went through that jury questionnaire, 11 there were 150 of you. And I'm sure many of you read that 12 questionnaire and thought to yourself, gee, this is about 13 Islam, this is about terrorism. Wow, this might be sort of an 14 interesting case, although I don't know that I want to go four or five weeks. 15 16 You walk upstairs and you saw all the press. Well, 17 this could be an interesting case. Then you walked inside and you saw all the marshals. Wow. I don't know that I want to 18 be here with all those marshals around. In fact, we've had 19 people ask are we going to be sequestered about this. 20 21 I mean, terrorist cases are serious, serious cases. 22 To be charged with that, to be a Muslim-American and be 23 charged with terrorism, stuck for the rest of his life,

whether you find him innocent or not, if you find him not

guilty, he's still going to be tarred with that.

24

25

1	Probably the witness that we put on, to me that was
2	the most difficult one, was Nathan Soofi. No kid should go
3	through that. I mean, the thought that his father showed him
4	beheading videos, people being burned alive is just beyond
5	tragic to me.
6	And what I found really upsetting was that the
7	government knew this. And they had interviewed him. And I
8	had asked Agent Whitson when he was on the stand in this case:
9	You've heard from three witnesses so far that said
10	that they should that they knew about the Muhammad Drawing
11	Contest before it occurred. Would you agree with that?
12	Could you say that again?
13	Yeah. We heard Mr. Verdugo said that he had heard
14	about the Muhammad Drawing Contest before it occurred.
15	Yes.
16	And the two juveniles Carlos and Juan both said that
17	they had heard about the drawing contest before it occurred.
18	Yes.
19	Okay. Did anyone else in your investigation, anyone
20	tell you that they had heard of this contest before it
21	occurred other than those two individuals those three
22	individuals?
23	No. Not that I recall.
24	And when Nathan Soofi got on the stand, he testified,
25	you know, okay, did you ever did your dad ever tell you

```
1
      that -- about a contest where they were going to draw pictures
 2
      of the Prophet Muhammad?
 3
               He said: Yes.
 4
               Well, I remember he said like it was in Texas.
 5
               Did he tell you if he thought that that was a bad
 6
      thing or a good thing?
 7
               Yeah. He said it was a bad thing. He said he was
      going to go there. He was going to go to Texas and go there
 8
      and then he was going to go to the building and start
 9
10
      shooting.
11
               But the part that was the most difficult is when I
12
      went on to ask him:
13
               Okay. Do you see the people that are sitting at this
14
      table and I pointed to the prosecution and to Agent Whitson.
15
               Yes.
               Have you ever seen them before?
16
17
               Yeah.
               Did you go to their office two or three weeks ago and
18
      talk to them?
19
               Yeah.
20
               Did you tell them the same thing that you've told us
21
22
      today?
23
               Yes.
24
               Why didn't the government put Nathan Soofi on the
25
      stand? Are they going to tell you that it was because they
```

didn't want to put him through this? They had interviewed him earlier back in May. And they now interview him two or three weeks before they bring him here.

He says my client, he never saw him spend the night over there -- and granted, Nathan Soofi was only there on the weekends -- he said he saw him a couple of times on occasion. Couldn't remember his name, the guy who's supposedly over there three or four days a week, two or three nights.

Nathan Soofi helps in putting the lie to his uncles testimony. Nathan Soofi demonstrates that the government was into this case for a conviction, not to try to find the truth. I mean, otherwise, Agent Whitson would have told me, oh, yeah, it was Nathan Soofi who told me two weeks ago or three weeks ago when I interviewed him with the prosecutors that he knew about this contest. But he had just told me no, he didn't.

One thing that's interesting -- and I'm going to put this on and it's not a very clear picture -- but I want you to look at it when you get into -- I can tell you that in the documents that you are going to get -- and you have a very large screen -- you can blow this up and it's very -- it's much clearer than it is on this camera.

But if you'll recall, the government told us when they showed us this picture that this man right here was my client.

My client is not bald. I mean, he doesn't have a lot

of hair. It might be me, but it's not him.

This is Simpson. This is Ali Soofi. This is Nathan Soofi. And this is someone else and I don't know who it is.

But they told you that that picture 250 was my client. It's not.

This has been an interesting case and it's coming to an end and we're probably all glad about that.

But you folks really are -- I mean, the jury is the buffer between the government and the rest of us. And the government has tried to instill you with fear. And that's what most of this has all been about. Not whether or not he's a member of the conspiracy, but you should be afraid, and therefore, you should convict somebody. He's got a bad name. He hung around with people that did a bad thing.

They -- many of us in this room -- I'm sure on the jury and all throughout this audience, we learn our sense of justice, in part at least, from reading Harper Lee's immortal To Kill a Mockingbird. And it was sort of -- I don't know if it's poetic, but she died the first week of this trial which was sort of interesting.

But it's in that book that we learn that there's community pressures at times that are on people to do things that aren't right. When Tom Robinson is convicted, everybody who reads the book, everybody who sees the movie, they know he's not guilty.

1 My client is a Muslim-American in a very bad 2 environment and climate right now. He is not guilty of these 3 charges. 4 Felon in Possession of a Weapon, it's not going to be 5 too hard for you. 6 The other four, he is not a co-conspirator. 7 evidence does not support the governments contention. The 8 government has withheld -- they did withhold evidence from you that we brought to your attention. 9 10 When you look at the evidence without passion or 11 prejudice, you can only come to one conclusion. The 12 government has not proved that he is guilty beyond a 13 reasonable doubt. 14 And I believe that you will take that instruction 15 that you've gotten from the government, you'll look at all the 16 evidence in this case, and you'll go in there and you'll find 17 that he is not guilty beyond a reasonable doubt of those charges that involve him traveling across state lines to 18 commit murder, conspiracy, aiding and abetting, aiding and 19 abetting or conspiracy with a terrorist organization or of 20 lying to the FBI. 21 22 Thank you. 23 THE COURT: Thank you, Mr. Maynard. 24 Ms. Brook? 25 MS. BROOK: Thank you, Your Honor.

1 REBUTTAL CLOSING ARGUMENT: GOVERNMENT 2 MS. BROOK: Good afternoon, ladies and gentlemen. 3 For the last hour-and-a-half the defense counsel has 4 stood before you and time and time again alleged that the 5 government is not here to find the truth and alleged that the 6 government is withholding evidence. 7 And as he said it over and over again -- bless you --8 he made mention to a couple of things. 9 One, witnesses that you heard from and who called 10 them; 11 Two, agents' testimony and calling into question 12 their credibility or their motives; 13 Three, whether or not pretrial interviews were 14 recorded. 15 Ladies and gentlemen, in this case which lasted four 16 weeks, the government called witnesses and those witnesses 17 were subpoenaed and came here and testified. In the criminal justice system it is the governments burden exclusively to 18 prove to you all beyond a reasonable doubt that the defendant 19 is quilty of a crime. 20 21 It is our burden and our burden exclusively. 22 The defendant doesn't have to say a thing. Doesn't 23 have to do a thing during the course of that trial. But, 24 ladies and gentlemen, make no mistake about it, the defendant

25

has subpoena power too.

1 So when defense counsel stands before you and says that the government was withholding evidence or the government 2 didn't call absolutely every witness, the defense can call 3 4 those witnesses too. 5 They made reference to Lupe. If the government -- if 6 the defendant wanted you to hear from Lupe, they have subpoena 7 power too. Defense counsel talked about pretrial interviews and 8 whether or not pretrial interviews in this case were recorded 9 10 and insinuated that things must have been covered up or the truth did not come out from those interviews. 11 12 Ladies and gentlemen, Special Agent Whitson testified and was asked specifically about that. The first question he 13 14 was asked: 15 And in this case have you -- oh --And in any case have you ever recorded pretrial 16 17 interviews? 18 Never. In your experience what's the general purpose of a 19 pretrial witness interview? 20 So a pretrial interview is an opportunity for the 21 22 prosecutors to speak with a person who is a potential witness 23 to kind of explain what the process is going to be, what they 24 can expect, and the kind of thing, just to give them a general 25 overview of the process.

1 And then also to go through the things, the 2 information that they have provided, and make sure the 3 prosecutors have a complete understanding of all of that 4 information. 5 Further, Special Agent Whitson was asked: 6 In every interview conducted in this case, was there 7 an admonition given? In pretrial witness interviews, is there an 8 admonition that was given to every witness? 9 10 Yes. What is it? 11 12 It's just to tell the truth. So over any time you go to a pretrial witness interview, that's going to be something 13 14 that's repeated over and over again to kind of help set them 15 at ease. It's just that at the end of the day when you're on 16 17 the stand, just tell the truth and then you don't have to think. You just tell the truth. 18 Ladies and gentlemen, defense counsel also talked 19 about the interview on May 5th that wasn't recorded and 20 insinuated that because the security camera footage was not 21 22 retrieved, that somehow evidence was covered up. 23 Special Agent Whitson testified that never in any 24 case has he ever heard of any agents subpoenaing security 25 camera footage or obtaining it.

And why? Because there's no audio.

And also, when you look at the defendant's interview on June 10th of 2015, the video, you can see up high in the corner the security camera footage. And you can see what that angle would reflect; a wide span of the entire room without any facial features or ability to see or decode peoples expresses.

But at the end of the day, ladies and gentlemen, all of these questions that defense counsel has stood before you and raised are distractions. Distractions to keep you from looking at the evidence that has come from this witness stand.

So let's start at the top.

Defense counsel started off by having you guys look at the conspiracy instructions and talking about the defendant just being merely present, and therefore, not being culpable. Defense counsel talked about friends, the defendants' friends, that he was around these people but he didn't do anything.

Ladies and gentlemen, first, the defendant chose

Elton Simpson as his friend. And time and time again, he

chose him. For a period of time he wasn't friends with him

because he thought that Ibrahim had put some sort of a tracker

or a device on his car and he was reporting on him to the FBI.

Just think about that for a second. The defendant was afraid that Ibrahim was reporting on him to the FBI.

What was the defendant afraid of?

So let's pause for a second and think about the snapshot that that provides into the defendant's mindset.

If the defendant knows that Simpson is interested in violent Jihadi material, if the defendant knows that Simpson spends time watching execution videos conducted by ISIS, if the defendant knows that Simpson has been convicted before, but yet over the months before Garland, the defendant is texting Simpson hundreds of times. They're in frequent contact. Even with all of that stuff, they remain close friends.

What does that tell you?

Well, let's put aside -- let's put into a box the question of what their friendship indicates. Because at the end of the day, the question is: What did the defendant himself do? This case isn't about who he was friends with. It's about what he did.

He provided guns to Ibrahim and to Nadir Soofi. He provided ammunition to them. He took them out shooting and he also trained them on how to use their weapons.

Ladies and gentlemen, engaging in illegal Backpage purchases of weapons or of ammunition with somebody who had a minimum you know supports ISIS, that in and of it itself tells you about the defendant's choices.

The evidence in this case shows that the defendant not only helped and aided his friends who he knew supported

the Islamic State and were intending to act out to attack in the name of the Islamic State, but it also shows that he wanted to attack too.

You've heard about the testimony. Him wanting to go into a mall with a bomb and blow himself up. You've also heard the testimony from the days and weeks after the contest was announced and the defendant was talking about wanting to go and shoot up the contest too.

Ladies and gentlemen, "mere presence" isn't you buying the bullets that end up on the ground in the scene at Garland, Texas.

Aiding and abetting. Let's talk about that as a concept. The defendant is charged with two conspiracies. In Count 1 and Count 5 he's charged with conspiracies.

Aiding and abetting applies to Count 1, Count 2, and Count 3. So in Count 1 and 2, the interstate transportation of firearms with the intent to commit a felony, Count 1 is the conspiracy; Count 2 is the actual crime.

Obviously, the defendant himself did not drive and transport those weapons to Texas, but he helped. And it is the aid that he provided that makes him guilty of those crimes.

But aid how? Defense counsel suggests that when the defendant purchased those weapons for Simpson and Soofi, at that point the contest had not yet been announced. What did

the defendant do after the contest was announced?

Well, he went out into the desert and he shot with Simpson and Soofi. He hosted them in his house to talk about the plan to attack the contest. He sat in Soofi and Simpson's living room and he taught them how to disassemble, lubricate, and reassemble those weapons, just as Ali Soofi testified to when he came in here.

And defense counsel asked, they said, well, you must be very -- you know, adept with weapons because you certainly described that well. And he responded: I don't own a weapon. I've shot before but I learned from watching.

Count 5, additionally, aiding and abetting applies to that count too. You don't have to find that the defendant was part of the conspiracy, that he was part of the plan itself between Simpson and Soofi, although the evidence that has come from this witness stand does show that.

All you have to find is that he helped the plan. If he helped the plan while knowing of the plan, what it was, and that was an evolving plan, as we know, it was an evolving plan over 2015 and in the late months of 2014, a plan that first came about talking about wanting to commit hijra, going to the Islamic State, evolved into attacks, attacks that included the United States military bases, recruitment centers, going in to bomb a mall, and in the end it crystallized into Garland.

And how did he help? The ways that we've talked

about already.

So defense counsel talked about other people, other individuals who may also be responsible or involved. At the beginning of this case, the judge read to you the Indictment. And when she did, it was clear that the "conspiracy" referred to the "defendant and others," others not named, but others.

Defense counsel asks you to consider other people;

AK, Nurse, and distract you from the evidence that implicates
the defendant. He brought before you all the indented letter
and he said that the indented letter somehow implicates
somebody else.

Well, let's talk about that letter for a moment. The indented letter itself was never found. What was found was a piece of paper that was etched over, sent to the lab, and they raised a letter. Let's assume -- or they raised the words from the page.

So let's assume, hypothetically, that that letter was found. And let's assume, hypothetically, that Simpson on the eve of the attack gave that letter to somebody else.

You have heard hours of testimony in this case from experts; experts who have talked to you about how ISIS is a well-oiled machine and they are trying to mobilize masses of people to attack the United States to support the Islamic State.

Implicated in that is the obvious point that a lot of

people are involved. Just because an additional person may also be involved, does not mean that the defendant isn't too involved. There are a lot of people. And the question for you to decide in this case is: Is the defendant guilty?

A defense to a bank robbery case isn't: I'm not guilty because when I robbed the bank, I did it with a friend and he's guilty, not me.

Just because more people may be responsible or involved or assisting doesn't take away from the defendant's involvement and his capability -- or his culpability for the manner in which he assisted, aided, helped to plan, and put together this attack.

Defense counsel also talked, similarly, about the letters from Hassan Jihaad. And we looked at just the letter backings, the outside. There was a letter in 2010, there was a letter in 2012, and a letter in 2014.

Two were addressed to Saabir Nurse, the 2010 and the 2012 one. The 2014 one was addressed to Elton Simpson. And remember, we opened that letter up. It was written with a typewriter. And what did it say? It was Hassan Jihaad trying to convince Ibrahim to not believe in the Khalifah, to believe in his mindset to support his terrorist group which is al-Qa'ida.

Defense is trying to insinuate that there is a conspiracy between somebody who is not ISIS and Elton Simpson.

You can see the letter. The letter is in evidence. Again, these are distraction techniques.

Defense counsel talked about Nathaniel and focused on just one part of what Nathaniel said, while excluding and ignoring all of the other pieces of Nathaniels testimony.

What Nathaniel testified to is that this plan came together in February. This plan came together months before the attack.

Now, when asked on the stand if he knew Malik, he said he had seen him. Nathaniel had testified that when he was at his dads house, it was weekends and he spent a lot of time with his dad. Make no mistake, it came out clearly from Nathaniel when he testified that him and his father keep some really big secrets.

His dad had told him as a secret that he was going to go attack Garland. He talked to him about the bullets and not leaving fingerprints. He showed him the gun. And he imparted upon him the information that he might not come back and he was going to kill Americans.

That was a secret between him and his dad. A secret he was not even allowed to tell his mom.

Defense counsel insinuates that if Nathaniel knew this information, that obviously, he would have to equally know information about the defendant. Let's just think about that for a moment in terms of common sense.

First, Nadir Soofi is obviously a very complicated individual, an individual who was mentally okay with committing jihad, martyring himself in order to kill masses of Americans. So getting in his head to understand exactly why he did what he did is a challenge.

But let's think about common sense. What Nadir does know is that Nathaniel is not going with him. Nathaniel is staying here. Which means, when and if Nadir does die while committing this jihad, the FBI and the police are going to come and find Nathaniel and talk to him.

Does it make sense that he would impart upon this 8-year-old information about co-conspirators and their identity, individuals who were not going with him to commit the attack?

Similarly to Ali, Nathaniel and Soofi in that house, along with the defendant, only extended certain information to certain people. Ali knew that the defendant, Simpson, and Soofi all supported ISIS. He knew that they watched those videos. He knew that the defendant wanted to kill kafirs.

But what didn't he know? He didn't know about any attack plans. And strategically, he didn't know that. Nadir was not going to impart that information on him, nor the defendant, nor Simpson, because all he has to do as an adult is just pick up the phone and call 911. And additionally, if he didn't do that, he would call his parents.

Common sense tells us that Nathaniel only knew what his dad wanted him to know.

Defense counsel talked to you about Sergio and questioned Sergios role in this. Why was Sergio necessary to go out to the desert to shoot? And it brings up a corollary point.

Defense counsel at the end thought it was odd, the question that was asked to the defendant about shooting in the desert by the agents on May 5th. Obviously, the defendant is a convicted felon. Simpson is a convicted felon. So they're not going to head off to the local range in order to shoot.

The desert is the obvious place where they would shoot if they're going to shoot.

But "Where in the desert?" is the question. Sergio testified that the summer before -- so the summer of 2014, that he was at a birthday party at his mothers house and that the defendant and Ibrahim were there too. And it became clear at that birthday party that behind moms house you couldn't fire rifles, that they were too loud. The defendant knew that. And in January, the defendant sought out Sergio to help him find a remote spot in the desert to shoot. And he did.

You can see from the evidence from the Wittmann scene that he shot and he shot there with the weapons that were used to conduct the attack.

But, ladies and gentlemen, obviously, at that point

Sergio wasn't needed again. Sergio had taken the defendant and Simpson and Soofi -- and by "taken," I mean shown, because the defendant himself drove Simpson and Soofi in his car to the shooting area.

It was a remote location. It was in Wittmann, an area where there are lots of remote locations as the witnesses testified to about the desert area out there.

So at that point he had given the defendant all he needed, those remote locations in the desert. We have heard that the defendant, Simpson, and Soofi proceeded over the following months to continue to go shooting out in the desert together. We have heard that from Ali. We have heard that from Mubarak. We have heard that from AK. And Verdugo talked about all the times that they went shooting together.

Obviously, ladies and gentlemen, not all criminals are masterminds. And in this case, Simpson, Soofi, and the defendant have left behind a lot of clues. And in this case they utilized Sergio for what they needed, which was to find that desert location. And he gave it to them and then the defendant could continue to go shooting with Simpson and Soofi and practice their shot in anticipation of the attacks that they were planning to make over those months in 2015.

Defense counsel suggests that you can't trust

Verdugo. You know, ladies and gentlemen, it would be great as
a prosecutor to come in here and to put on witnesses in any

case who were maybe two nuns and a school teacher. The defendant was friends with Verdugo. It was the defendant's friendship with Verdugo that made Verdugo a witness in this case.

Defense counsel has insinuated benefits and we've talked about those. And at the end of the day, it is up to you all to determine the credibility of any witness based upon a lot of factors.

And one of them is corroboration; to look for corroboration of witnesses' testimony to determine whether or not what they are saying bears truthfulness.

With Ali, the corroboration -- I'm sorry -- with

Verdugo, the corroboration is Ali. Two men. They don't know each other. They have never met. They live in different places, but yet they report the exact same thing about the defendant.

They report that the defendant was watching the ISIS execution videos. They report that the defendant kept saying he wanted to kill kafirs. They both report that during 2015, the defendant and Simpson and Soofi went shooting together in the desert and they both talk about the defendant's reaction to the Charlie Hebdo attack.

Defense counsel suggests that you can't trust Verdugo because of the absence of a recorded call which somehow talked about the attack or had the defendant make an admission about

1 the attack.

Ladies and gentlemen, from the evidence that's come from this witness stand, it's clear that the defendant is paranoid of law enforcement.

What did he say to James Sampson in his first or so call after he found out from Stuart that Ibrahim was likely dead in the attack that he knew was going to take place -- and we're going to get to that in a second. He said: I can't talk to you about this on the phone.

Is it logical then to infer that he's going to make admissions on the phone with anybody or Verdugo?

Corroboration with Verdugo.

You also look to Juan. And a small detail, but an important one, Verdugo testified about the mirrors inside the Cochise house of the defendant's, that house that he lived in up until the middle of March of 2015, the one where Juan and Carlos lived across the street.

He talked about how the defendant had hung mirrors so that he could see from one room into the other rooms.

When the defendant testified, he testified that the room in the Cochise house that he spent the most time in was the prayer room.

And then Juan. Juan testified that it was through those angled mirrors that he stood in the hallway on that very first time that he heard the defendant talk about the Garland

1 contest and his desire to shoot it up. He stood there in the 2 hall and he saw the words come out of the defendant's mouth by 3 looking in that angled mirror where he could see him into the 4 prayer room. 5 One last point about Verdugo. James Sampson, the 6 defendant's own brother. What did he say about Verdugo back 7 in June? We heard the recording two days ago. And he said: 8 He's a good kid. He tries to help to fix things that he doesn't know how to, like refrigerators, but he's a good kid. 9 10 Defense counsel talked at length and called Ali a 11 liar. And, again, ladies and gentlemen, you are the judges of 12 credibility in this case and you exclusively. Defense counsel 13 talked about how Ali disclosed information about the 14 defendant. And he said that the manner in which he disclosed 15 the information means that you can't trust the information and 16 he is not telling the truth. 17 Well, what did Ali say? Initially, did you tell the FBI about Malik? 18 No. No, I didn't. No. 19 Did you deliberately not tell them about Malik? 20 Yes. 21 22 Why? 23 I mean just from my -- you know, generally meeting 24 somebody, you know, the vibe you get off of people and the 25 general actions of somebody, you can tell, you know, how

```
1
      violent a person is over what they're capable of.
 2
               I mean just from stories that I have heard, instances
      that he was involved in, just the general, you know, the
 3
      feeling of the person. You know, that you just feel what
 5
      they're capable of.
 6
               Eventually, did you tell them?
 7
               Yes, after I had gone to my brothers funeral and I
      was interviewed in Kansas.
 8
 9
               Additionally, he was asked:
10
               Did you hold back information because of your fear of
11
      people that Malik was associated with?
12
               His response: Yes.
               So let's talk about that. Ali testified about his
13
14
      fear of the defendant and other people, about his fear that
15
      they would come after him for retaliation or come after him --
16
      them -- him to make them join him.
17
               He talked about that fear.
               And what brought home that fear for Ali? What we
18
      learned during AKs testimony.
19
               We learned during AKs testimony that in the hours
20
      after the attack in Garland, AK called Ali.
21
22
               And he told Ali: Do not talk to the police.
23
               He made that call because Malik told him to make that
24
      call.
25
               Not only was he afraid of Malik because of him being
```

physically afraid of him or afraid he might get hurt, but

Malik had made sure that Ali wouldn't talk by reaching out to

him in the hours after his brother was killed to send the

message.

And, ladies and gentlemen, if the defendant wasn't a co-conspirator with Simpson and Soofi, if the defendant wasn't in the house with Simpson and Soofi and Ali, how would he ever know Ali? How would he ever know Alis phone number? And most importantly, why in the world would he care what Ali told to the police unless he knew that he had to cover his tracks, because he knew what Ali had seen of him.

Ali had known about his support for the Islamic

State, about how he had talked about wanting to kill kafirs.

Ali knew the defendant and the defendant reached out through

AK to make sure he didn't talk.

Defense counsel -- we're going to get into this briefly -- defense counsel talked a lot about the timing of individuals, how the individuals who testified talked about time and equated how they were able to report a time that an event happened, or whether or not that individual was telling the truth.

And he put on the overhead a page from Alis transcript. And he said see, Ali here in this transcript says that it was between March -- or February and March that Nadir Soofi came back with that weapon and talked about the

```
1
      defendant giving him the money to buy it.
 2
               Page 29 on direct examination, what did Ali say?
               The defendant said, oh, well, you know --
 3
               Or defense counsel said Ali was wrong about the
 5
               It was, you know, February or March.
                                                      That's the
 6
      reason why it's inconsistent and you can't understand or test
 7
      his credibility.
 8
               In the beginning he said this:
 9
               I want to talk about other weapons. At some point
10
      did your brother come home with an AK style weapon?
11
               His response: Yes. He had come home with a full
12
     body AK.
13
               Do you remember when that was?
14
               It was roughly four months before the incident.
15
               So roughly around January?
16
               Around January time.
17
               It was on cross-examination when asked was it
      February or March, he said: I think so.
18
19
               Let's talk about timing. Defense counsel has argued
      to you that you can't trust Juans testimony. You can't trust
20
      Carlos's testimony or any other adult who may not have the
21
22
      timing of an event correct. You can't trust them about the
23
      substance of what they heard.
24
               Ladies and gentlemen, common sense tells us that with
25
      children and with some adults, they're not great with dates
```

and they're not great with times. And that inability to pinpoint actual dates or times doesn't have any bearing upon their clear memories of significant events that have happened in their lives.

So, children may not remember exactly when they went to Disneyland or when they went to Legoland or when they went to their friend's birthday party, but they do remember being at their friend's birthday party. They remember the significant events like the first time they road on the Matterhorn or taking that picture with Mickey Mouse.

Kids are kids. And they may not remember exactly when something happened. For instance, a child may clearly remember a clown that was at her best friends birthday party when she was a kid. She remembers the red pants that they were wearing, that crazy yellow hat, the big scary eyes, and at 19 can still talk about that clown.

But if you ask her: Was that in the fall or in the spring or did that birthday party happen in the morning or the afternoon? And all bets are off.

Mr. Maynard is a very skilled cross-examiner and he did a very good job confusing children and even some of the adults on time.

At the end of the day the question is: Did the substance of the events that they reported, the significant events that they heard in their life, did the substance of

those events stay the same and stay consistent?

And, again, ladies and gentlemen, you look to the corroboration. I'm not going to belabor the point at this stage, but there are a couple of key details.

One is this:

Juan and Carlos. Brothers. Did they testify to the exact same memories? Or did each of them testify to individual and distinct memories that they had? Did each of them testify that they hadn't spoken to the other about the memories that they had?

The corroboration is in those details, the way in which they can report what happened based on what else was going on and the memories they have, the totality of the events.

And one quick one with Carlos was Fox News. When he talked about the Jordanian pilot being burned alive, when he talked about waking up because of the obnoxious laughter of the defendant who then came in and got him and brought him into the other room to watch that man burn alive. He said he saw it on Fox News.

And what did Evan Kohlmann testify to? That the only network that actually released that footage was Fox News. It was scandalous. And it was, you know, something maybe there was some backlash for Fox for doing, but nonetheless, those are the details, the corroborating details to look for.

I have a couple more quick points and I know it's been a long day, so we'll move quickly through it.

Defense has made a big deal out of the defendant's reaction, his reaction to learning that Ibrahim had been killed, that reaction at Red Lobster and in the hours afterwards.

On one hand he said he was too upset. Right? The defendant was too upset to have been part of the plan because he wouldn't have been a jihadist if he was upset. Or he wasn't happy enough, something similar, along those lines.

Made a big deal out of his reaction. Highlighting, as the defense is arguing, that he was unaware.

Well, let's take a closer look at what happened in those hours after the defendant learned that after the plan he had put into play, Ibrahim had predictably died.

What happened? He's sitting at Red Lobster. He gets the call. The call comes from Stuart. Stuart lets them know that the news is calling because Ibrahim has been involved in a shoot-out and it's everywhere. It's all over the news.

Was the defendant's reaction the same as the emotional display you all saw a few days ago? Was he welled up? Was he sad? No. He called the waiter over. He told you from his own testimony: I called the waiter over and asked him to box up my food to go.

Additionally, look at the text messages. How did the

```
1
      defendant respond in those hours after?
 2
               You will see when you look at these records that the
 3
      defendant was in these hours -- so 8:30, 8:21 on May 3rd,
 4
      receiving texts from an individual who was doing some postings
 5
      for him as you can read from the text messages that continue:
 6
               Are you there?
 7
               And then he texted him back at 8:46.
               Brother, call me.
 8
 9
               Again, sending to the same number, a phone number,
10
      and then:
               Brother, why don't you call me back?
11
12
               Again, continuing this discussion with him in the
13
      early morning hours:
14
               Hello brother.
15
               He gets a message.
16
               Now I'll post your ads.
17
               He responds, doing these business-as-usual text
18
      messages:
               Okay brother. Please post. Okay brother. Please
19
20
      post.
21
               And you can see that ads were posted.
22
               And then as those hours continued, him negotiating
23
      other pick-ups, business pick-ups, with somebody who he was
24
      doing a job with.
25
               The other reason that you know through these text
```

```
1
      messages is his effort to silence Ali. And you see that
 2
      through the exchange that he has here with AK:
 3
               Text me the dang number already.
               And he does.
               And we know what AK then did on his behalf.
 5
 6
               Dr. Vidino testified about how individuals
 7
      predictably respond to circumstances and act in these
 8
      situations in order to act in accordance with how people would
      anticipate them to act.
 9
10
                 As we wrap up, look to the defendant's statements
      that he made on the stand. Did the defendant lie?
11
12
               Mr. Koehler talked at length about it before and I'm
13
      just going to highlight a couple quick points.
14
               Defense counsel stood before you and said: Look at
15
      the chiropractic documents. They support the defendant.
16
      as you look at those documents, the question is:
                                                         Who wrote
17
      them and for what purpose?
               But at the end of the day, let's look at some other
18
      lies that the defendant made on the stand and why.
19
               One of them he testified that in the month of April,
20
      he only saw Ibrahim twice. He said once was on the 6th and
21
2.2
      once was on the 22nd and those were the only two times.
23
               So are there pieces of evidence that you have that,
24
      even from just these evidence, you can see that that is a lie?
25
               Text messages between the defendant and Ibrahim on
```

```
1
      April 12:
 2
               Question -- or message sent:
 3
               I want to know if you want me to pick you up on the
 4
      way. Dinner is ready.
 5
               To which he responds -- Simpson responds:
 6
               Okay. You can. Insha Allah. Okay.
 7
               Did the defendant talk about them seeing each other
 8
      that day? Or the next day?
 9
               I'll come and get you.
10
               Okay.
               Text from Kareem.
11
12
               Simpson: Insha Allah.
13
               Kareem: Okay. I'll be right there.
14
               Brother I'm outside.
15
               Okay.
16
               Ladies and gentlemen, you also heard from Mustafa
17
      Hassan who said on April 30th he saw the defendant with
18
      Ibrahim at that restaurant.
               And these are just the pieces of evidence left behind
19
20
      about their connection which the defendant lied about when he
21
      sat there.
2.2
               At the end of the day, the question is this:
23
               Why would a man engage in illicit Backpage ammunition
24
      purchases with Ibrahim? Why would he provide Simpson and
25
      Soofi guns? Why would he take them shooting over and over
```

1 again? Why would he teach them how to maintain and to keep 2 their weapons? 3 Why? Because he knew that Simpson and Soofi were 4 ISIS supporters. He too supported the Islamic State. And he 5 wanted to help them act and attack and kill kafirs in the name 6 of ISIS to support the Islamic State. 7 The evidence in this case has come from the witness 8 stand and it has come from numerous different places, numerous different witnesses, people who have been eyewitnesses and 9 10 have seen and heard and testified. 11 And the instructions tell you that at the end of the 12 day, there's not any one number of witnesses that you need to 13 look for. 14 You have heard from multiple witnesses who explain and recount the defendant's attachments, his affiliation, and 15 16 his ideology. And the fact that he wanted to attack America 17 in order to support the Islamic State. Ladies and gentlemen, we ask you to hold the 18 defendant accountable and to find him quilty of all five 19 20 counts. 21 Thank you. 22 FINAL INSTRUCTIONS TO THE JURY 23 THE COURT: Thank you, Ms. Brook. 24 Ladies and gentlemen when you begin your 25 deliberations, elect one member of the jury as your presiding

juror who will preside over the deliberations and speak for you here in court.

You will then discuss the case with your fellow jurors to reach agreement if you can do so. Your verdict, whether guilty or not guilty, must be unanimous.

Each of you must decide the case for yourself, but you should do so only after you have considered all the evidence, discussed it fully with the other jurors, and listened to the views of your fellow jurors.

Do not be afraid to change your opinion if the discussion persuades you that you should. But do not come to a decision simply because other jurors think it is right.

It is important that you attempt to reach a unanimous verdict but, of course, only if each of you can do so after having made your own conscientious decision. Do not change an honest belief about the weight and effect of the evidence simply to reach a verdict.

Because you must base your verdict only on the evidence received in the case and on these instructions, I remind you that you must not be exposed to any other information about the case or to the issues it involves.

Except for discussing the case with your fellow jurors during your deliberations:

Do not communicate with anyone in any way and do not let anyone else communicate with you in any way about the

merits of the case or anything to do with it. This includes discussing the case in person, in writing, by phone or electronic means, via e-mail, text messaging, or any interstate -- Internet chat room, blog, website or other feature. This applies to communicating with your family members, your employer, the media or press, and the people involved in the trial. If you are asked or approached in any way about your jury service or anything about this case, you must respond that you have been ordered not to discuss the matter and to report the contact to the court.

Do not read, watch, or listen to any news or media accounts or commentary about the case or anything to do with it; do not do any research, such as consulting dictionaries, searching the Internet or using other reference materials; and do not make any investigation or in any other way try to learn about the case on your own.

The law requires those restrictions to ensure the parties have a fair trial based on the same evidence that each party has had an opportunity to address. A juror who violates these restrictions jeopardizes the fairness of these proceedings. If any juror is exposed to any outside information, please notify the court immediately.

The punishment provided by law for this crime is for the court to decide. You may not consider punishment in deciding whether the government has proved its case against

the defendant beyond a reasonable doubt.

Verdict forms have been prepared for you. After you have reached unanimous agreement on the verdicts, your presiding juror should complete the verdict forms according to your deliberations, sign and date them, and advise the law clerk that you are ready to return to the courtroom.

If it becomes necessary during your deliberations to communicate with me, you may send me a note through the law clerk, signed by any one or more of you. No member of the jury should ever attempt to communicate with me except by a signed writing, and I will respond to the jury concerning the case only in writing or here in open court. If you send out a question, I will consult with the lawyers before answering it, which may take some time. You may continue your deliberations while waiting for the answer to any question. Remember that you are not to tell anyone, including me, how the jury stands, numerically or otherwise, on any question submitted to you, including the question of the guilt of the defendant, until after you have reached a unanimous verdict or have been discharged.

Ladies and gentlemen, you will receive five forms of verdict; one for each count. I will not read them to you. I will just describe that for each count, except Count 3, your verdict will simply ask you to state whether or not you find the defendant guilty or not guilty of the crime charged in

1 that count. 2 With respect to Count 3, which is the charge Making False Statements to the Federal Bureau of Investigations, if 3 you find the defendant quilty of that crime, you will be asked 5 to indicate on the jury form which of the alleged four false 6 statements you have unanimously found that the defendant made. 7 Do counsel have any additions or corrections to the instructions as read? 8 9 MR. KOEHLER: No, Your Honor. 10 MR. MAYNARD: No, Your Honor. 11 THE COURT: Ladies and gentlemen, at this time I'm 12 going to ask Maureen to select three of you as alternate jurors. She will make this selection by lot, having put your 13 14 juror numbers in a little box, and she will pick three of 15 them. THE CLERK: Juror No. 2, Juror No. 12, and Juror No. 16 17 16. THE COURT: The three of you have been chosen as the 18 alternates in this case. That means that you will not 19 participate in the deliberations. However, it does not mean 20 that you are now free to discuss the case with anyone you 21 22 wish. 23 In the unlikely circumstance that during 24 deliberations a juror had to be excused because of an illness 25 or a personal emergency, so long as you had not discussed the

case with anyone, we would be able to call one or more of the alternates to come in and deliberate with the jury.

So I'm going to ask the three of you to leave your notebooks here. We will keep your notes until the verdicts have been returned, at which time we will make sure your notes are shredded.

And also, if you would provide contact information to Maureen, we will call you when the verdicts have been returned, let you know what they are, and when we do that, at that time the admonition will be lifted and you will be free to discuss the case with anyone you wish.

I want to thank the three of you very much for participating as jurors in this trial.

You may be disappointed that you have been selected as alternates, but I want you to know that your presence here has been extremely important.

We lost one of our four alternates during the course of the trial and it's possible that we could have lost more. Your presence has assured that we did not have to start over and retry the case because we had lost a juror during the trial.

You are free to leave the courthouse when your fellow jurors retire to begin deliberations. And, again, I want to thank you very much for your participation in this trial.

Before I have Sanessa sworn, I want to mention a

couple of other things.

First, it's 3:25. Obviously, you will be able to go back and get organized and begin your deliberations. But what's important now is that the schedule, within reasonable limits, is up to you. You can deliberate for as long as you wish this afternoon or you can get organized and decide to come back after the weekend.

When you decide to adjourn today, please call

Sanessa -- she will give you her number -- and let her know.

And then also let her know what time you will be returning next week.

I did want to mention that if all 12 of you wished to come back on Monday to deliberate, you would be free to do that. But I'm sure that you have -- because of the schedule, that may not be possible and it would have to be that all 12 of you felt that it was convenient to do so.

Otherwise, you can come back on Tuesday. And, again, let Sanessa know what time you wish to return to begin deliberations.

And, again, I just read to you a lengthy admonition that applies during any recess, including the weekend recess. And please be sure not to let anyone know what the status of your deliberations is.

At this time I will ask if Sanessa could please come forward and be sworn as the bailiff.

1 (Bailiff duly sworn.) THE COURT: I forgot to mention how we're going to 2 handle the exhibits. 3 4 The paper exhibits, the photographic exhibits, you 5 will be able to view on a large screen that will be in the 6 jury room. Sanessa will show you how to work it. It's really 7 easy. There's also an index of the exhibits on there, so all 8 of the numbers of the exhibits that have been admitted are in the index along with a brief description of what the exhibit 9 10 is. 11 However, there's also all of these physical exhibits, 12 exhibits that can't be shown on the television screen. 13 The physical exhibits that are not firearms or 14 ammunition we'll send in. If you don't want it today, we don't have to give it to you today. But we will send it in so 15 16 you have it available to look through if you need to or wish 17 to. With respect to the firearms and ammunition, if you 18 wish to inspect the firearms or ammunition in the jury room, 19 you may do that. But you'll have to send a note out and ask 20 me, at which time I will have them sent in. 21 22 You can look at them for as long as you like and then 23 we'll take them out again. 24 I want to remind you that every time somebody

testified about them, we had them tell you that they were safe

25

```
1
      and in a position with zip ties where they couldn't be fired.
 2
      If, in fact, you do handle any of the firearms in this case,
      please be careful with them.
 3
               If you want to see the ammunition, we will also send
 4
 5
      that in and let you look at the ammunition for as long as you
 6
      like and then remove it when you're finished. However, do not
 7
      ask for the guns and the ammunition at the same time because
      we will only provide one or the other, but not both.
 8
 9
               So let Sanessa know if you wish to have the physical
10
      evidence brought in this afternoon and we'll send it in.
11
      Otherwise, we will have it waiting for you when you return
      after the weekend.
12
13
               The jury may now go to the jury room to begin
14
      deliberations.
15
               (Jury retires at 3:29 p.m.)
               (Open court, no jury present at 3:30 p.m.)
16
17
               THE COURT: Please sit down.
               Mr. Koehler, is there anything else we need to
18
      discuss?
19
               MR. KOEHLER: Not from the government, Your Honor.
20
               THE COURT: Mr. Maynard?
21
22
               MR. MAYNARD: No, ma'am.
23
               THE COURT: A couple of things. Are you going to
24
      just hang around until you find out when the jury is going
25
      home today?
```

1 MR. KOEHLER: Yes. 2 THE COURT: You too, Mr. Maynard? 3 MR. MAYNARD: Yes. THE COURT: Good. Then we will handle any questions 5 we receive by telephone unless you happen to be here. 6 So make sure that you provide Maureen with telephone 7 numbers where we can reach you and which will be answered and 8 not go to some voicemail. 9 We will also, if we can, if you're at a location 10 where we can fax you the question, we will do so so that you have a chance to look at it. 11 12 The only time that I will require the presence of 13 counsel and the defendant if the jury sends out a note is if 14 they send out a note that indicates a desire to have testimony 15 read back or send out a note that would reflect an inability 16 to reach a unanimous verdict when I would have to address them 17 in court. Other than that, we should be able to handle any questions in writing. 18 So I have already admonished the jury with respect to 19 the evening recess, so I will not bring them back in the 20 courtroom again today to further admonish them. 21 22 If, when they come back next week, whether it's Monday or Tuesday, but I'm going to guess it's going to be 23 24 Tuesday, if they were to continue on deliberations until the 25 next day, I would bring them back into the courtroom at the

```
1
      evening recess to admonish them, but I do not require that
 2
      counsel be present for that admonition.
 3
               I simply place it on the record, find out when
 4
      they're coming back the next day, and then will advise you
 5
      both that they have gone for the day and what time they're
 6
      returning for the next day.
 7
               Okay. If there is nothing else, court is at recess.
          (Recess taken at 3:32 p.m.; resumed at 3:59 p.m.)
 8
 9
          (Open court, no jury present.)
10
               THE COURT: Let the record show the presence of
      counsel. The jury is not present. The defendant is not
11
12
      present.
13
               I want to report that the jury has gone home.
14
      They're coming back Tuesday morning at 9:00 a.m. and they
      specifically asked before they left if they could wait and
15
16
      have this answer on Tuesday morning.
17
               So, when you started showing pages of transcript, I
      knew this was coming and I have prepared the following answer
18
      for your consideration.
19
20
               "No."
               It goes on. No, it goes on, because "no" is just too
21
22
      abrupt.
               "You must rely on your own memories and notes of what
23
24
      witnesses said. The lawyers had the court reporter prepare
25
      some portions of the testimony of some witnesses. There is
```

```
not a full trial transcript available."
 1
 2
               Agreeable?
 3
               MR. KOEHLER: Yes.
 4
               MR. MAYNARD: That's agreeable.
 5
               THE COURT: Okay. Then they will have this on
 6
      Tuesday morning.
               I did not choose to add more information about if
 7
      they have any specific question about what any specific
 8
      witness said. We can read to them, but if they do, we'll deal
 9
      with it then.
10
               MR. KOEHLER: Okay. Thank you.
11
12
               MS. BROOK:
                          Thank you.
13
               THE COURT: So Tuesday morning, just make sure
14
      starting at nine o'clock that Mr. Koehler and/or Ms. Brook,
     Mr. Maynard and/or Ms. Plomin are available if we call.
15
16
               MR. KOEHLER: We shall.
17
               MR. MAYNARD: We shall.
18
               THE COURT: Have a nice weekend.
19
          (Proceedings adjourned at 4:01 p.m.)
20
21
22
23
24
25
```

1	
2	CERTIFICATE
3	
4	I, ELIZABETH A. LEMKE, do hereby certify that I am
5	duly appointed and qualified to act as Official Court Reporter
6	for the United States District Court for the District of
7	Arizona.
8	I FURTHER CERTIFY that the foregoing pages constitute
9	a full, true, and accurate transcript of all of that portion
10	of the proceedings contained herein, had in the above-entitled
11	cause on the date specified therein, and that said transcript
12	was prepared under my direction and control.
13	DATED at Phoenix, Arizona, this 1st day of August,
14	2016.
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	s/Elizabeth A. Lemke ELIZABETH A. LEMKE, RDR, CRR, CPE
20	EDIZADETH A. DERKE, KDR, CRR, CFE
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	